arXiv:1304.6182v1 [math.OC] 23 Apr 2013

TWO DIFFERENT APPROACHES TO STOCHASTIC RECURSIVE OPTIMAL CONTROL PROBLEM WITH DELAY AND APPLICATIONS[*]

JINGTAO SHI[†]

Abstract. This paper is concerned with one kind of stochastic recursive optimal control problem with time delay, where the controlled system is described by a stochastic differential delayed equation (SDDE). The cost functional is of the recursive utility' type, which is formulated as the solution to a backward stochastic differential delayed equation (BSDDE). Two approaches to study such problem are Bellman's dynamic programming and Pontryagin's maximum principle. When only the pointwise and distributed time delays in the state variable, and only distributed time delay in the generator of BSDDE, a generalized Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation in finite dimensional space is obtained applying the dynamic programming approach and a generalized Itô's formula. Sufficient and necessary maximum principles are both derived, where the adjoint equation is a forward-backward stochastic differential delayed equation (FBSDDE). Moreover, the relationship between these two approaches are investigated. Under some differentiability assumptions, connections among the value function, the adjoint processes and the generalized Hamiltonian function are investigated.

A consumption and portfolio optimization problem with recursive utility and bounded memory in the financial market, is discussed to show the applications of our result. Explicit solutions in a finite dimensional space derived by the two different approaches, coincide.

Key words. Stochastic optimal control, stochastic differential delayed equation, dynamic programming principle, maximum principle, backward stochastic differential delayed equation, consumption and portfolio optimization

AMS subject classifications. 93E20, 60H10, 34K50, 91G80

1. Introduction.

The research of many natural and social phenomena shows that the future development of many processes depends not only on their present state but also essentially on their previous history. Such processes can be described by *stochastic differential delayed equations* (SDDEs). Many examples can be found in Mohammed [20, 21]. Stochastic optimal control problems with time delay are those whose dynamics of states are described by SDDEs, and to find some optimal control to maximum/minimize the corresponding cost functionals or utility functions. In general, stochastic optimal control problems with time delay are practically intractable because of the complex infinite-dimensional state space framework.

However, in certain cases, stochastic optimal control problem with time delay can be reduced to a finite-dimensional one and solved explicitly. To the best of our knowledge, the first example of such a solvable problem is a linear delayed system with a quadratic cost functional, given by Kolmanovskii and Maizenberg [16] (see also Kolmanovskii and Shaikhet [17]), where only the pointwise and distributed time delays are involved in the state variable (see (1.2) in this section). Then Elsanosi et al. [11], Larssen and Risebro [19] extend Bellman's dynamic programming principle to time delayed case, where the initial problems are reduced to finite-dimensional Markovian systems and then obtain suitable versions of the *Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations* (HJB equations). Then, their applications to optimal harvesting was considered in Elsanosi et al. [11], to optimal consumption problems under partial observation was

---

[*] This work is is supported by National Natural Sciences Foundations of China (No. 11201264) and Shandong Province (No. ZR2011AQ012).

[†] School of Mathematics, Shandong University, Jinan 250100, China. E-mail: shijingtao@sdu.edu.cn

studied in Elsanosi and Larssen [10], and to stochastic portfolio optimization model with bounded memory was studied in Chang et al. [4] recently.

Along another line, Øksendal and Sulem [22] apply Pontryagin's maximum principle to discuss stochastic optimal control problems with time delay, where also only the pointwise and distributed time delays are involved in the state variables. Sufficient conditions for optimality are given by the Hamiltonian function and three adjoint equations, two of which are *backward stochastic differential delayed equations* (BSDDEs) and the other one is a *backward ordinary differential delayed equation* (BODDE). Stochastic optimal control problems with time delay by the maximum principle approach, can also be seen in Chen and Wu [5], Øksendal et al. [23], Agram et al. [1] and Yu [34], where *anticipated* or *time-advanced* BSDEs of Peng and Yang [25]'s type are used (note that there are also time delays in the control variable in [5], [34]).

Now, let us present the stochastic optimal control problem with time delay. Let $\{W(t), t \geq 0\}$ be a one-dimensional Brownian motion on a complete probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. We assume that the filtration $\mathcal{F}_t^s = \sigma\{W(\tau); s \leq \tau \leq t\}$ is augmented by all the $\mathbb{P}$-null sets in $\mathcal{F}$. Let $0 \leq T < \infty$ be the fixed time duration and $0 \leq \delta < \infty$ be the constant time delay. Denote $C([-\delta, 0]; \mathbb{R})$ the Banach space of continuous functions $\gamma : [-\delta, 0] \to \mathbb{R}$ with norm $||\gamma||_C := \sup_{-\delta \leq t \leq 0} |\gamma(t)|$.

For given initial time $s \in [0, T)$, the dynamics of the state is described by the following SDDE

$$\begin{cases} dX^{s,\varphi;u}(t) = b(t, X^{s,\varphi;u}(t), X_1^{s,\varphi;u}(t), X_2^{s,\varphi;u}(t), u(t))dt \\ \qquad\qquad + \sigma(t, X^{s,\varphi;u}(t), X_1^{s,\varphi;u}(t), X_2^{s,\varphi;u}(t), u(t))dW(t), \quad t \in (s, T], \\ X^{s,\varphi;u}(t) = \varphi(t - s), \ t \in [s - \delta, s]. \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

Here continuous function $\varphi : [-\delta, 0] \to \mathbb{R}$ is the initial path of $X^{s,\varphi;u}(\cdot)$. Let $\mathbb{U} \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a nonempty convex set. Control process $u : \Omega \times [0, T] \to \mathbb{U}$ is an $\mathcal{F}_t^s$-adapted process and

$$X_1^{s,\varphi;u}(t) = \int_{-\delta}^0 e^{\lambda\tau} X^{s,\varphi;u}(t + \tau)d\tau, \quad X_2^{s,\varphi;u}(t) = X^{s,\varphi;u}(t - \delta), \tag{1.2}$$

represent given functionals of the path segment $X_t^{s,\varphi;u} := \{X^{s,\varphi;u}(t + \tau); \tau \in [-\delta, 0]\}$ of $X^{s,\varphi;u}(\cdot)$. $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ is the given *averaging parameter.* $b : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{U} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\sigma : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{U} \to \mathbb{R}$ are given continuous functions.

For given $(s, \varphi) \in [0, T) \times C([-\delta, 0]; \mathbb{R})$, we denote $\mathcal{U}[s, T]$ as the set of controls $u(\cdot)$ with the property that if $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[s, T]$ then (1.1) admits a unique $\mathcal{F}_t^s$-adapted solution $X^{s,\varphi;u}(\cdot)$. We refer to such $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[s, T]$ as an admissible control and $(u(\cdot), X^{s,\varphi;u}(\cdot))$ as an admissible pair.

Let $f : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{U} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $h : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ be given continuous functions. For given $(s, \varphi) \in [0, T) \times C([-\delta, 0]; \mathbb{R})$ and admissible control $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[s, T]$, consider the following cost functional

$$J(s, \varphi; u(\cdot)) = \mathbb{E}\bigg\{ \int_s^T f(t, X^{s,\varphi;u}(t), X_1^{s,\varphi;u}(t), u(t))dt + h(X^{s,\varphi;u}(T), X_1^{s,\varphi;u}(T)) \bigg\}. \tag{1.3}$$

Problem (SOCPD). The *stochastic optimal control problem with time delay* is to find $u^*(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[s, T]$, such that

$$V(s, \varphi) = J(s, \varphi; u^*(\cdot)) = \inf_{u(\cdot) \in \ \mathcal{U}[s,T]} J(s, \varphi; u(\cdot)), \tag{1.4}$$

for all $(s,\varphi)\in[0,T)\times C([-\delta,0];\mathbb{R})$, with $V(T,\varphi)=h(\varphi(0)),\varphi\in C([-\delta,0];\mathbb{R})$. Such a control process $u^*(\cdot)$ is called an *optimal control* of **Problem (SOCPD)** (if it exists). The corresponding solution $X^{s,\varphi;u}(\cdot)$ is called the *optimal state* and $V(s,\varphi)$ is called the *value function*.

Problem (SOCPD) and its applications in economics and finance has been studied by many authors. Among others, Larssen [18] and Larssen and Risebro [19] established the dynamic programming principle for this problem, and then obtained the corresponding HJB equation in a finite dimensional space. Under certain conditions, they prove that the value function is the unique viscosity solution to the HJB equation. Øksendal and Sulem [22] apply the maximum principle approach to obtain some sufficient conditions for optimality, by the Hamiltonian function and three adjoint equations, in which two of them are BSDDEs and the other one is a BODDE. The relationship between these two approaches is studied recently by Shi [28]. Under the assumption that the value function is enough smooth, connections among its derivatives, the adjoint processes and the generalized Hamiltonian function are given.

In this paper, we study this kind of stochastic optimal control problem with time delay, in the case when the cost functional $J(s,\varphi;u(\cdot))$ (1.3) is replaced by a functional of *recursive utility type*. As found by Chen and Wu [6], this kind of utility functional can be regarded as the solution to a BSDDE, which is a natural generalization of classical BSDE to time delayed case. For more information about stochastic optimal control problems with recursive utility functionals and their applications, please refer to Duffie and Epstein [7], El Karoui et al. [8, 9], Schroder and Skiadas [26], Wu and Yu [32], Wang and Wu [30], Shi and Wu [29], Wu [31] and the references therein.

More precisely, we introduce the following controlled BSDDE coupled with the above SDDE (1.1):

$$\begin{cases} -dY^{s,\varphi;u}(t)=f\big(t,X^{t,\varphi;u}(t),X_1^{t,\varphi;u}(t),Y^{s,\varphi;u}(t),Z^{s,\varphi;u}(t),u(t)\big)dt\\ \qquad\qquad\qquad -Z^{t,\varphi;u}(t)dW(t),\quad t\in[s,T],\\ \ Y^{s,\varphi;u}(T)=\phi(X^{s,\varphi;u}(T),X_1^{s,\varphi;u}(T)).\end{cases}\tag{1.5}$$

Here $f:[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^2\times\mathbb{R}^2\times\mathbb{U}\rightarrow\mathbb{R},\phi:\mathbb{R}^n\rightarrow\mathbb{R}$ are given functions.

For given $(s,\varphi)\in[0,T)\times C([-\delta,0];\mathbb{R})$ and admissible control $u(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}[s,T]$, the *recursive utility functional* is defined as follows

$$J_r(s,\varphi;u(\cdot))=-Y^{s,\varphi;u}(t)\big|_{t=s}.\tag{1.6}$$

Here $\mathcal{U}[s,T]$ is defined as the set of controls $u(\cdot)$ such that if $u(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}[s,T]$ then SDDE (1.1) and BSDDE (1.5) admit unique $\mathcal{F}_t^s$-adapted solutions $X^{s,\varphi;u}(\cdot)$ and $(Y^{s,\varphi;u}(\cdot),Z^{s,\varphi;u}(\cdot))$, respectively, for all $(s,\varphi)\in[0,T)\times C([-\delta,0];\mathbb{R})$.

Problem (SROCPD). The *stochastic recursive optimal control problem with time delay* is to find $u^*(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}[s,T]$, such that

$$V_r(s,\varphi)=J_r(s,\varphi;u^*(\cdot))=\operatorname*{essinf}_{u(\cdot)\in\,\mathcal{U}[s,T]}J_r(s,\varphi;u(\cdot)),\tag{1.7}$$

for all $(s,\varphi)\in[0,T)\times C([-\delta,0];\mathbb{R})$, with $V_r(T,\varphi)=-\phi(\varphi(0)),\varphi\in C([-\delta,0];\mathbb{R})$.

This problem can be reformulated as follows. The state process $(X^{s,\varphi;u}(\cdot),Y^{s,\varphi;u}(\cdot),$

$Z^{s,\varphi;u}(\cdot)$) of our system is described by the following coupled FBSDDE

$$\begin{cases} dX^{s,\varphi;u}(t) = b(t, X^{s,\varphi;u}(t), X_1^{s,\varphi;u}(t), X_2^{s,\varphi;u}(t), u(t))dt \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad + \sigma(t, X^{s,\varphi;u}(t), X_1^{s,\varphi;u}(t), X_2^{s,\varphi;u}(t), u(t))dW(t), \\ -dY^{s,\varphi;u}(t) = f\big(t, X^{t,\varphi;u}(t), X_1^{t,\varphi;u}(t), Y^{s,\varphi;u}(t), Z^{s,\varphi;u}(t), u(t)\big)dt \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad - Z^{t,\varphi;u}(t)dW(t), \quad t \in [s,T], \\ X^{s,\varphi;u}(t) = \varphi(t-s), \ t \in [s-\delta, s], \\ Y^{s,\varphi;u}(T) = \phi(X^{s,\varphi;u}(T), X_1^{s,\varphi;u}(T)), \end{cases} \tag{1.8}$$

and the cost functional is given of the form

$$\begin{aligned} J_r(s,\varphi;u(\cdot)) &= -Y^{s,\varphi;u}(s) \\ = \ & -\mathbb{E}^{s,\varphi;u}\bigg\{ \int_s^T f\big(t, X^{t,\varphi;u}(t), X_1^{t,\varphi;u}(t), Y^{s,\varphi;u}(t), Z^{s,\varphi;u}(t), u(t)\big)dt \\ & \qquad + \phi(X^{s,\varphi;u}(T), X_1^{s,\varphi;u}(T)) \bigg\}. \end{aligned} \tag{1.9}$$

Here $\mathbb{E}^{s,\varphi;u}[\cdot]$ denotes expectation with respect to the law of $X^{s,\varphi;u}(\cdot)$.

Problem (FBSOCPD). The *forward-backward stochastic optimal control problem with time delay* is to find $u^*(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[s,T]$, such that

$$V_r(s,\varphi) = J_r(s,\varphi;u^*(\cdot)) = \operatorname*{essinf}_{u(\cdot)\in\ \mathcal{U}[s,T]} J_r(s,\varphi;u(\cdot)), \tag{1.10}$$

for all $(s,\varphi) \in [0,T) \times C([-\delta,0];\mathbb{R})$, with $V_r(T,\varphi) = -\phi(\varphi(0)), \varphi \in C([-\delta,0];\mathbb{R})$.

To our best knowledge, there are only a few papers on forward-backward stochastic optimal control problems with time delay (see Fuhrman et al. [13], Huang et al. [14], Shi [27], Huang and Shi [15], Chen and Wu [6], Agram and Øksendal [2]). In Fuhrman et al. [13], under infinite dimensional space framework, for some special case of optimal control problem of FBSDDEs, the value function is proved to be a mild solution to the corresponding HJB equation and the existence of optimal controls in the weak sense is proved. In Huang et al. [14], explicit optimal controls are obtained for some kind of linear anticipated FBSDDE by Riccati equations. In Shi [27], maximum principles for optimal control of anticipated FBSDDE with time varying delay and Poisson jumps are proved. In Huang and Shi [15], both necessary and sufficient maximum principles for optimal control problem for one kind of fully coupled anticipated FBSDDE are derived. In Chen and Wu [6], stochastic recursive optimal control problem of SDDE in a general form is considered and the dynamic programming principle is presented. However, the value function is proved to be the viscosity solution to the corresponding infinite dimensional HJB equation, and no examples with explicit solutions are presented.

Recently, the optimal control problem of an infinite horizon system governed by a FBSDDE with pointwise and distributed time delays was studied, by Agram and Øksendal [2]. Sufficient and necessary maximum principles for optimal control under partial information in infinite horizon are obtained. An optimal consumption problem with respect to recursive utility from a cash flow with delay was discussed as their applications. However, since in their paper the adjoint backward equation is described as an anticipated BSDE of Peng and Yang [25]'s type, no explicit solution is given (note that a solvable special case is given only when there is no time delay in [2]).

True, the solution to a stochastic (recursive) optimal control problem with time delay will depend on the initial condition φ, which is in an infinite dimensional space $C([-\delta,0];\mathbb{R})$. However, if the system of SDDE (1.1) depends only on the time delay through processes $X_1(\cdot)$ and $X_2(\cdot)$ defined by (1.2) (that is, the system involve only the pointwise and distributed time delays in the state variable), and the generator f of BSDDE (1.5) depends only on $(X(\cdot),X_1(\cdot))$ not $X_2(\cdot)$, the problem can be reduced to a finite dimensional one and it is possible to obtain the solution in a finite dimensional space. This is the first main contribution of this paper, and we will make this point clear in Section 2.

The other main contribution in this paper is that we initiate to study the relationship between Bellman's dynamic programming and Pontryagin's maximum principle approaches, for stochastic recursive optimal control problems with time delay. Such a topic is of great importance in stochastic control theory, see the systematic monograph by Yong and Zhou [33] and the references therein. Since the relationship between these two approaches is the one between the derivatives of the value function and the adjoint processes along the optimal state, or actually the one between HJB equations and stochastic Hamiltonian systems, and more generally, the one between *partial differential equations* (PDEs) and *stochastic differential equations* (SDEs). Thereby, is is natural to ask the question: Are there any relations between these two extensively used and important approaches, for stochastic optimal control problems with time delay? The answer should be yes. However, to the best of our knowledge, results on this topic are quite lacking in literature. One main difficulty and obstacle is that the solution to a stochastic optimal control problem with time delay, or controlled system with SDDE, will be in an infinite dimensional space framework. For generalization of Bellman's dynamic programming principle to time delayed case, see Larssen [18], Chang et al. [3], Federico [12], where several versions of infinite dimensional HJB equations have been used. Moreover, their solvability in the infinite dimensional spaces is complicated and consequently their real applications are largely limited. Along another line, with the establishment of the theory of anticipated BSDEs by Peng and Yang [25], Chen and Wu [5] developed necessary and maximum principles for the controlled system involving time delays in both the state variable and the control variable. And their results are applied to a production and consumption choice problem and explicit optimal consumption rate is obtained for some special case.

In this paper, we consider the stochastic recursive optimal control problem with time delay (1.8)$\sim$(1.10). For this problem, in Section 2, under some suitable assumptions, we first establish the dynamic programming principle for this problem and obtain the corresponding generalized HJB equation in a *finite* dimensional space. These results are natural corollaries of those in Chen and Wu [6]. Then we derive the sufficient and necessary maximum principles for the optimal controls. The adjoint equation that we introduce in this paper consists of one SDDE, two BSDDEs and one BODE, which is different from the one in Agram and Øksendal [2]. In Section 3, we investigate the relationship between the above two approaches: dynamic programming principle and maximum principle. Under the assumption that the value function is enough smooth, we obtain the relations among its derivatives, the adjoint processes and the generalized Hamiltonian function. A consumption and portfolio optimization problem with recursive utility and bounded memory in the financial market is discussed in Section 4, to show the applications of our result. Explicit solutions in a finite dimensional space derived by the maximum principle and dynamic programming approaches, coincide. Finally, Section 5 gives some concluding remarks.

2. Preliminaries, Maximum Principle and Dynamic Programming. In this section, under some suitable assumptions, we first establish the dynamic programming principle and present the corresponding HJB equation in finite dimensional space. Then we derive sufficient and necessary maximum principles for the optimal controls. Our results gain enlightenment from the work by Chen and Wu [6], Agram and Øksendal [2].

For any $s \in [0, T)$, the following notations are used in this paper.

$$\begin{aligned} &L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_T^s; \mathbb{R}) := \Big\{\mathbb{R}\text{-valued } \mathcal{F}_T^s\text{-measurable random variables } \xi;\ \mathbb{E}|\xi|^2 < \infty\Big\},\\ &S_{\mathcal{F}}^2([s,T]; \mathbb{R}) := \Big\{\mathbb{R}\text{-valued } \mathcal{F}_t^s\text{-adapted processes } \psi(t);\ \mathbb{E}\Big[\sup_{s\le t\le T}|\psi(t)|\Big] < \infty\Big\},\\ &L_{\mathcal{F}}^2([s,T]; \mathbb{R}) := \Big\{\mathbb{R}\text{-valued } \mathcal{F}_t^s\text{-adapted processes } \psi(t);\ \mathbb{E}\int_s^T |\psi(t)|^2 dt < \infty\Big\},\\ &\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega; C([-\delta,0];\mathbb{R}); \mathcal{F}_t^s) := \Big\{\psi : \Omega \to C([-\delta,0];\mathbb{R}) \text{ is } \mathcal{F}_t^s\text{-measurable; the norm}\\ &\qquad\qquad ||\varphi||^2_{\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega;C([-\delta,0];\mathbb{R}))} := \mathbb{E}\Big[||\varphi(\omega)||^2_{C([-\delta,0];\mathbb{R})}\Big] < \infty\Big\}. \end{aligned}$$

First, in order to ensure the existence of the unique solution to the SDDE (1.1), we introduce the following assumptions.

(H1) The functions $b(t,x,x_1,x_2,u)$ and $\sigma(t,x,x_1,x_2,u)$ are joint continuous and globally Lipschitz in (x,x_1,x_2), that is, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &|b(t,x,x_1,x_2,u) - b(t,\hat{x},\hat{x}_1,\hat{x}_2,u)| + |\sigma(t,x,x_1,x_2,u) - \sigma(t,\hat{x}_1,\hat{y}_2,\hat{z},u)|\\ &\le\ C(|x-\hat{x}| + |x_1-\hat{x}_1| + |x_2-\hat{x}_2|), \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0,T], x, \hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}, x_1, \hat{x}_1 \in \mathbb{R}, x_2, \hat{x}_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u \in \mathbb{U}$.

(H2) There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$|b(t,x,x_1,x_2,u)| + |\sigma(t,x,x_1,x_2,u)| \le\ C(1+|x|+|x_1|+|x_2|),$$

for all $t \in [0,T], x \in \mathbb{R}, x_1 \in \mathbb{R}, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u \in \mathbb{U}$.

(H3) The initial path φ belongs to the space $\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega; C([-\delta,0];\mathbb{R}); \mathcal{F}_s^s)$ of $\mathcal{F}_s^s$-measurable elements in $\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega; C([-\delta,0];\mathbb{R}))$, that is, $\varphi : \Omega \to C([-\delta,0];\mathbb{R})$ is $\mathcal{F}_s^s$-measurable and

$$||\varphi||^2_{\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega;C([-\delta,0];\mathbb{R}))} := \mathbb{E}\Big[||\varphi(\omega)||^2_{C([-\delta,0];\mathbb{R})}\Big] < \infty.$$

The following classical result can be seen in Mohammed [20, 21].

Lemma 2.1. *Under assumptions (H1)∼(H3), for any* $(s,\varphi) \in [0,T) \times \mathbb{L}^2(\Omega; C([-\delta,0];\mathbb{R}))$ *and* $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[s,T]$, *the SDDE (1.1) admits a unique adapted strong solution*

$$X^{s,\varphi;u}(\cdot) \in \mathbb{L}^2(\Omega; C([-\delta,0];\mathbb{R}); \mathcal{F}_t^s).$$

Next, in order to ensure the existence of the unique solution to the BSDDE (1.5), we introduce the following assumptions.

(H4) $f(\cdot,x,x_1,y,z,u)$ is $\mathcal{F}_t^s$-measurable, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}, x_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u \in \mathbb{U}$.

(H5) The functions $f(t,x,x_1,y,z,u)$ and $\phi(x,x_1)$ are joint continuous and globally Lipschitz in (x,x_1,y,z), that is, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &|f(t,x,x_1,y,z,u) - f(t,\hat{x},\hat{x}_1,\hat{y},\hat{z},u)| + |\phi(x,x_1) - \phi(\hat{x},\hat{x}_1)|\\ &\le\ C(|x-\hat{x}| + |x_1-\hat{x}_1| + |y-\hat{y}| + |z-\hat{z}|), \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0,T], x, \hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}, x_1, \hat{x}_1 \in \mathbb{R}, x_2, \hat{x}_2 \in \mathbb{R}, y, \hat{y} \in \mathbb{R}, z, \hat{z} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u \in \mathbb{U}$.

(H6) There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$|f(t,x,x_1,0,0,u)| + |\phi(x,x_1)| \leq \ C(1+|x|+|x_1|),$$

for all $t \in [0,T], x \in \mathbb{R}, x_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u \in \mathbb{U}$.

The following result can be obtained from the classical BSDE theory, by Lemma 2.1. See also Chen and Wu [6].

LEMMA 2.2. *Under assumptions (H1)∼(H6), for any* $(s,\varphi) \in [0,T) \times \mathbb{L}^2(\Omega; C([-\delta,0];\mathbb{R}))$ *and* $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[s,T]$*, the BSDDE (1.5) admits a unique adapted solution*

$$(Y^{s,\varphi;u}(\cdot), Z^{s,\varphi;u}(\cdot)) \in S^2_{\mathcal{F}}([s,T];\mathbb{R}) \times L^2_{\mathcal{F}}([s,T];\mathbb{R}).$$

Now, we turn to consider **Problem (SROCPD)** or the equivalent **Problem (FBSOCPD)**. The first approach is the Belmann's dynamic programming principle. In general, the value function $V_r(s,\varphi)$ defined in (1.10) may depend on the initial path $\varphi \in C([-\delta,0];\mathbb{R})$ in a complicated way. From Theorem 3.7 of Chen and Wu [6], we know that the value function satisfies the following generalized dynamic programming principle:

$$\begin{aligned} V_r(s,\varphi) = -\operatorname*{essinf}_{u\in\mathcal{U}[s,T]} \mathbb{E}^{s,\varphi;u}\Big[\int_s^{\hat{s}} f\big(t, X^{s,\varphi;u}(t), X_1^{s,\varphi;u}(t), Y^{s,\varphi;u}(t), Z^{s,\varphi;u}(t), u(t)\big)dt \\ + V_r\big(\hat{s}, X_{\hat{s}}^{s,\varphi;u}\big)\Big],\ \forall \hat{s} \in [s,T]. \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

Here $X_{\hat{s}}^{s,\varphi;u}$ is the map $X_{\hat{s}}^{s,\varphi;u} : [-\delta,0] \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by $X_{\hat{s}}^{s,\varphi;u}(\tau) := X^{s,\varphi;u}(\hat{s}+\tau)$. If we define the operator $\mathcal{A}^u$ on Borel measurable function $V_r : [0,T] \times C([-\delta,0];\mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\mathcal{A}^u V_r(s,\varphi) := \lim_{\hat{s}\downarrow s} \frac{\mathbb{E}[V_r\big(\hat{s}, X_{\hat{s}}^{s,\varphi;u}\big)] - V_r(s,\varphi)}{\hat{s}-s}, \tag{2.2}$$

then by (2.1) the value function $V_r(s,\varphi)$ solves the following

$$\begin{cases} \sup\limits_{u\in\mathbf{U}} \Big\{\mathcal{A}^u V_r(s,\varphi) + f(s,\varphi,-V_r(s,\varphi),-\nabla_0 V_r(s,\varphi)\sigma(s,\varphi,u),u)\Big\} = 0, \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \forall (s,\varphi) \in [0,T) \times C([-\delta,0];\mathbb{R}), \\ V_r(T,\varphi) = -\phi(\varphi), \quad \forall \varphi \in C([-\delta,0];\mathbb{R}), \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

where $\nabla_0 V_r(s,\varphi) \equiv \nabla_\varphi V_r(s,\varphi)(\{0\})$ and $\nabla_\varphi V_r(s,\varphi)$ is the gradient of V_r with respect to φ at point (s,φ). This is a *backward stochastic evolution equation* (BSEE) in infinite dimension space (see Theorem 4.9 of Chen and Wu [6] for the derivation of BSEE (2.3)). However, looking at the recursive cost functional (1.9) and (1.10), one might expect that the value function $V_r(s,\varphi)$ depends on φ only through the two functionals

$$x = x(\varphi) := \varphi(0), \quad x_1 = x_1(\varphi) := \int_{-\delta}^0 e^{\lambda\tau}\varphi(\tau)d\tau.$$

In fact if this is the case, the operator $\mathcal{A}^u$ defined by (2.2) is a differential operator and the equation (2.3) is a second order HJB *partial differential equation* (PDE). This is essentially due to the fact that there is an Itô's formula in this text.

LEMMA 2.3. *(The Itô's formula) Let* $g \in C^{1,2,1}([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^2)$*, processes* $(X(\cdot), X_1(\cdot), X_2(\cdot))$ *are defined by (1.1) and (1.2), then for given* $u \in \mathbb{U}$*, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
&dg(t,X(t),X_1(t))\\
&=\Big\{\frac{\partial g}{\partial t}(t,X(t),X_1(t))+b(t,X(t),X_1(t),X_2(t),u)\frac{\partial g}{\partial x}(t,X(t),X_1(t))\\
&\qquad+\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2(t,X(t),X_1(t),X_2(t),u)\frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial x^2}(t,X(t),X_1(t))\\
&\qquad+\big[X(t)-\lambda X_1(t)-e^{-\lambda\delta}X_2(t)\big]\frac{\partial g}{\partial x_1}(t,X(t),X_2(t))\Big\}dt\\
&\quad+\sigma(t,X(t),X_1(t),X_2(t),u)\frac{\partial g}{\partial x}(t,X(t),X_1(t))dW(t).
\end{aligned}\tag{2.4}$$

The proof of this Itô's formula can be seen in Elsanosi et al. [11] or Elsanosi and Larssen [10].

THEOREM 2.4. *(The Generalized HJB Equation) If the value function* V_r *for* **Problem (FBSOCPD)** *depends on* (s,x,x_1) *only and* $V_r(s,x,x_1) \in C^{1,2,1}([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^2)$*, then* $V_r(s,x,x_1)$ *solves the following generalized HJB equation*

$$\begin{cases}
-\dfrac{\partial V_r}{\partial s}(s,x,x_1)+\sup\limits_{u\in\mathbf{U}}G\Big(s,x,x_1,x_2,u,-V_r(s,x,x_1),-\dfrac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(s,x,x_1),\\
\qquad\qquad\qquad-\dfrac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(s,x,x_1),-\dfrac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(s,x,x_1)\Big)=0,\ \forall x_2\in\mathbb{R},\\
V_r(T,x,x_1)=-\phi(x,x_1),
\end{cases}\tag{2.5}$$

where the generalized Hamiltonian function $G:[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^3\times\mathbb{U}\times\mathbb{R}^4\to\mathbb{R}$ *is defined as*

$$\begin{aligned}
G(s,x,x_1,x_2,u,r,p,R,q)&:=b(s,x,x_1,x_2,u)p\\
&+\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2(s,x,x_1,x_2,u)R+\big(x-\lambda x_1-e^{-\lambda\delta}x_2\big)q\\
&+f(s,x,x_1,r,\sigma(s,x,x_1,x_2,u)p,u).
\end{aligned}\tag{2.6}$$

Proof. Fix $(s,x,x_1)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^2$ and $u\in\mathbb{U}$. Let $X^{s,x,x_1;u}(\cdot)$ be given by SDDE (1.1) with $u(t)\equiv u$, and fix $\varphi\in C([-\delta,0];\mathbb{R})$ such that $x=x(\varphi)=X^{s,x,x_1;u}(s)$ and $x_1=x_1(\varphi)=X_1^{s,x,x_1;u}(s)$. And let $(Y^{s,x,x_1;u}(\cdot),Z^{s,x,x_1;u}(\cdot))$ be the corresponding solution to BSDDE (1.5). Then (2.1) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
&V_r(s,x,x_1)\\
&=-\inf_{u\in\mathcal{U}[s,T]}\mathbb{E}^{s,x,x_1;u}\Big[\int_s^{\hat{s}}f^{s,x,x_1;u}(t)dt+V_r\big(\hat{s},X_{\hat{s}}^{s,x,x_1;u}\big)\Big],\ \forall\hat{s}\in[s,T],
\end{aligned}\tag{2.7}$$

where for notations simplicity, we use (and will use in this proof)

$$\begin{aligned}
f^{s,x,x_1;u}(t)&=f\big(t,X^{s,x,x_1;u}(t),X_1^{s,x,x_1;u}(t),Y^{s,x,x_1;u}(t),Z^{s,x,x_1;u}(t),u(t)\big),\\
b^{s,x,x_1;u}(t)&=b(t,X^{s,x,x_1;u}(t),X_1^{s,x,x_1;u}(t),X_2^{s,x,x_1;u}(t),u(t)),\\
\sigma^{s,x,x_1;u}(t)&=\sigma(t,X^{s,x,x_1;u}(t),X_1^{s,x,x_1;u}(t),X_2^{s,x,x_1;u}(t),u(t)).
\end{aligned}$$

Comparing (2.7) with (2.1), we have replaced the essential infimum "essinf" by the infimum "inf". Since by Proposition 3.2 of Chen and Wu [6], we know that the value function $V_r(s,x,x_1)$ is now a deterministic function.

First, (2.7) implies that

$$V_r(s,x,x_1)\leq -\mathbb{E}^{s,x,x_1;u}\Big[\int_s^{\hat{s}} f^{s,x,x_1;u}(t)dt+V_r\big(\hat{s},X_{\hat{s}}^{s,x,x_1;u}\big)\Big],\quad \forall \hat{s}\in[s,T].$$

Applying the Itô's formula (Lemma 2.3) and with $\hat{s}\downarrow s$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{\hat{s}\downarrow s}\frac{1}{\hat{s}-s}\mathbb{E}\int_s^{\hat{s}}\bigg[\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial t}(t,X^{s,x,x_1;u}(t),X_1^{s,x,x_1;u}(t))\\
&\qquad +b^{s,x,x_1;u}(t)\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t,X^{s,x,x_1;u}(t),X_1^{s,x,x_1;u}(t))\\
&\qquad +\frac{1}{2}\big[\sigma^{s,x,x_1;u}(t)\big]^2\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(t,X^{s,x,x_1;u}(t),X_1^{s,x,x_1;u}(t))\\
&\qquad +\big[X^{s,x,x_1;u}(t)-\lambda X_1^{s,x,x_1;u}(t)-e^{-\lambda\delta}X_2^{s,x,x_1;u}(t)\big]\\
&\qquad\qquad \times\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(t,X^{s,x,x_1;u}(t),X_1^{s,x,x_1;u}(t))\bigg]dt\\
&=\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial s}(s,x,x_1)+b(s,x,x_1,x_2,u)\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(s,x,x_1)\\
&\quad +\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2(s,x,x_1,x_2,u)\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(s,x,x_1)+\big[x-\lambda x_1-e^{-\lambda\delta}x_2\big]\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(s,x,x_1)\\
&=\lim_{\hat{s}\downarrow s}\frac{\mathbb{E}[V_r\big(\hat{s},X_{\hat{s}}^{s,\varphi;u}\big)]-V_r(s,\varphi)}{\hat{s}-s}\\
&\geq\lim_{\hat{s}\downarrow s}\frac{1}{\hat{s}-s}\mathbb{E}^{s,x,x_1;u}\int_s^{\hat{s}} f^{s,x,x_1;u}(t)dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Then by (2.2) and (2.3), we have

$$\begin{cases} Y^{s,x,x_1;u}(s)=-V_r(s,x,x_1),\\ Z^{s,x,x_1;u}(s)=-\dfrac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(s,x,x_1)\sigma(s,x,x_1,x_2,u),\ \forall x_2\in\mathbb{R}.\end{cases}\tag{2.8}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial s}(s,x,x_1)+b(s,x,x_1,x_2,u)\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(s,x,x_1)\\
&\quad +\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2(s,x,x_1,x_2,u)\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(s,x,x_1)+\big[x-\lambda x_1-e^{-\lambda\delta}x_2\big]\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(s,x,x_1)\\
&-f\big(s,x,x_1,-V_r(s,x,x_1),\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(s,x,x_1)\sigma(s,x,x_1,x_2,u),u\big)\geq 0,\ \forall x_2\in\mathbb{R}.
\end{aligned}$$

This holds for any $u\in\mathbf{U}$, and by the definition of G (2.6), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
-\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial s}(s,x,x_1)+\sup_{u\in\mathbf{U}}G\Big(&s,x,x_1,x_2,u,-V_r(s,x,x_1),-\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(s,x,x_1),\\
&-\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(s,x,x_1),-\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(s,x,x_1)\Big)\leq 0,\ \forall x_2\in\mathbb{R}.
\end{aligned}\tag{2.9}$$

Conversely, for any $\varepsilon > 0, 0 \le s < \hat{s} \le T$ with $\hat{s} - s$ small enough, we can find a $u(\cdot) \equiv u_{\varepsilon,\hat{s}}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[s,T]$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&V_r(s,x,x_1) + \varepsilon(\hat{s}-s) \\
&\ge -\mathbb{E}^{s,x,x_1;u}\Big[\int_s^{\hat{s}} f^{s,x,x_1;u}(t)dt + V_r\big(\hat{s}, X_{\hat{s}}^{s,x,x_1;u}\big)\Big],\ \forall \hat{s} \in [s,T],
\end{aligned}$$

or equivalently,

$$-\varepsilon \le -\frac{\mathbb{E}[V_r\big(\hat{s}, X_{\hat{s}}^{s,\varphi;u}\big)] - V_r(s,\varphi)}{\hat{s}-s} + \frac{1}{\hat{s}-s}\mathbb{E}^{s,x,x_1;u}\int_s^{\hat{s}} f^{s,x,x_1;u}(t)dt.$$

Again, it follows from the Itô's formula (Lemma 2.3) that

$$\begin{aligned}
-\varepsilon \le \frac{1}{\hat{s}-s}\mathbb{E}\int_s^{\hat{s}}\Big[&-\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial t}(t, X^{s,x,x_1;u}(t), X_1^{s,x,x_1;u}(t)) \\
&- b^{s,x,x_1;u}(t)\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t, X^{s,x,x_1;u}(t), X_1^{s,x,x_1;u}(t)) \\
&- \frac{1}{2}\sigma^{s,x,x_1;u2}(t)\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(t, X^{s,x,x_1;u}(t), X_1^{s,x,x_1;u}(t)) \\
&- \big[X^{s,x,x_1;u}(t) - \lambda X_1^{s,x,x_1;u}(t) - e^{-\lambda\delta}X_2^{s,x,x_1;u}(t)\big] \\
&\quad \times \frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(t, X^{s,x,x_1;u}(t), X_1^{s,x,x_1;u}(t)) \\
&+ f\big(t, X^{s,x,x_1;u}(t), X_1^{s,x,x_1;u}(t), -V_r(t, X^{s,x,x_1;u}(t), X_1^{s,x,x_1;u}(t)), \\
&\quad \frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t, X^{s,x,x_1;u}(t), X_1^{s,x,x_1;u}(t))\sigma^{s,x,x_1;u}(t), u(t)\big)\Big]dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Again, as $\hat{s} \downarrow s$, by the definition of G (2.6), we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
-\varepsilon &\le -\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial s}(s,x,x_1) + G\Big(s,x,x_1,x_2,u,-V_r(s,x,x_1), -\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(s,x,x_1), \\
&\qquad -\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(s,x,x_1), -\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(s,x,x_1)\Big) \\
&\le -\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial s}(s,x,x_1) + \sup_{u\in\mathbf{U}} G\Big(s,x,x_1,x_2,u,-V_r(s,x,x_1), -\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(s,x,x_1), \\
&\qquad -\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(s,x,x_1), -\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(s,x,x_1)\Big),\ \forall x_2 \in \mathbb{R}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

Combining the inequalities (2.9) with (2.10) gives (2.5). The terminal condition follows immediately from the definition of the value function. The proof is complete. □

The second approach to solve **Problem (FBSOCPD)** is the Pontryagin's maximum principle. In this part, we let the initial time $s = 0$ and write $X = X^u = X^{0,\varphi;u}$, etc. Moreover, we need the following additional assumptions.

(H7) The functions $b(t,x,x_1,x_2,u), \sigma(t,x,x_1,x_2,u)$ are continuously differentiable in (x,x_1,x_2,u), such that

$$\mathbb{E}\Big\{\int_0^T \Big(\Big|\frac{\partial b}{\partial \lambda}(t,X(t),X_1(t),X_2(t),u(t))\Big|^2 + \Big|\frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial \lambda}(t,X(t),X_1(t),X_2(t),u(t))\Big|^2\Big)dt\Big\} < \infty,$$

for $\lambda = x, x_1, x_2, u$.

(H8) The function $f(t,x,x_1,y,z,u)$ is continuously differentiable in (x,x_1,y,z,u) and $\phi(x,x_1)$ is continuously differentiable in (x,x_1), such that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\bigg\{\int_0^T\Big|\frac{\partial f}{\partial\lambda}(t,X(t),X_1(t),Y(t),Z(t),u(t))\Big|^2dt\\ +\Big|\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial x}(X(T),X_1(T))\Big|^2+\Big|\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial x_1}(X(T),X_1(T))\Big|^2\bigg\}<\infty,\end{aligned}$$

for $\lambda = x, x_1, y, z, u$.

We introduce the Hamiltonian function $H : [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^5\times\mathbb{U}\times\mathbb{R}^3\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^2\to\mathbb{R}$ as

$$\begin{aligned}&H(t,x,x_1,x_2,y,z,u,\vec{p},q,\vec{k}) := p_1b(t,x,x_1,x_2,u)\\ &\quad+p_2\big(x-\lambda x_1-e^{-\lambda\delta}x_2\big)+k_1\sigma(t,x,x_1,x_2,u)-qf(t,x,x_1,y,z,u),\end{aligned}\tag{2.11}$$

where $\vec{p}=(p_1,p_2,p_3)^\top,\vec{k}=(k_1,k_2)^\top$.

For each $u^*(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}[0,T]$ and the corresponding solutions $(X^*(\cdot),Y^*(\cdot),Z^*(\cdot))$ to (1.1) and (1.5), we introduce the following *adjoint equation*

$$\begin{cases}-dp_1(t)=\dfrac{\partial H^*}{\partial x}(t)dt-k_1(t)dW(t),\\ -dp_2(t)=\dfrac{\partial H^*}{\partial x_1}(t)dt-k_2(t)dW(t),\\ -dp_3(t)=\dfrac{\partial H^*}{\partial x_2}(t)dt,\\ \quad dq(t)=-\dfrac{\partial H^*}{\partial y}(t)dt-\dfrac{\partial H^*}{\partial z}(t)dW(t),\quad t\in[0,T],\\ \quad p_1(T)=-\dfrac{\partial\phi}{\partial x}(X^*(T),X_1^*(T))q(T),\\ \quad p_2(T)=-\dfrac{\partial\phi}{\partial x_1}(X^*(T),X_1^*(T))q(T),\\ \quad p_3(T)=0,\quad q(0)=1,\end{cases}\tag{2.12}$$

where for notation simplicity, we use (and will use in the remaining part of this section)

$$\begin{aligned}H^*(t)&=H(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t),X_2^*(t),Y^*(t),Z^*(t),u^*(t),\vec{p}(t),q(t),\vec{k}(t)),\\ \frac{\partial H^*}{\partial\rho}(t)&=\frac{\partial H}{\partial\rho}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t),X_2^*(t),Y^*(t),Z^*(t),u^*(t),\vec{p}(t),q(t),\vec{k}(t)),\end{aligned}$$

for $\rho = x, x_1, x_2, y, z, u$. Note that the above adjoint equation (2.12) consists of two BSDDEs, one BODDE and one SDDE. From the definition H in (2.11), under assumptions (H7)∼(H8), there exists unique $\mathcal{F}_t^0$-adapted solution $(\vec{p}(\cdot)=(p_1(\cdot),p_2(\cdot),p_3(\cdot))^\top$, $q(\cdot),\vec{k}(\cdot)=(k_1(\cdot),k_2(\cdot))^\top)$ to them.

In recent work of Agram and Øksendal [2], sufficient and necessary maximum principles for infinite horizon FBSDDE with Poisson jumps are obtained. In their paper, the backward part of the adjoint equation is described as a time advanced BSDE of Øksendal et al. [23]'s type, which is different from the adjoint backward part in (2.12) where three equations with respect to $p_1(\cdot),p_2(\cdot)$ and $p_3(\cdot)$ are involved. The introduction of this type of adjoint backward equation comes from Øksendal and

Sulem [22]. For practicable importance, our adjoint backward equations in (2.12) are more easier to be solved explicitly than the time advanced ones.

THEOREM 2.5. *(Sufficient Maximum Principle) Let $u^*(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}$, $(X^*(\cdot), Y^*(\cdot), Z^*(\cdot))$ be the corresponding solutions to (1.1) and (1.5), and $\vec{p}(\cdot) = (p_1(\cdot), p_2(\cdot), p_3(\cdot))^\top$, $q(\cdot), \vec{k}(\cdot) = (k_1(\cdot), k_2(\cdot))^\top$ be the corresponding solutions to (2.12). Suppose that*

$$(x, x_1, x_2, y, z, u) \to H(t, x, x_1, x_2, y, z, u, \vec{p}(t), q(t), \vec{k}(t)) \text{ is convex,} \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T], \tag{2.13}$$

$$\phi(x, x_1) = Mx + Nx_1, \quad \text{for } M, N \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{2.14}$$

$$p_3(t) = 0, \ \text{for all } t \in [0, T], \tag{2.15}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial H^*}{\partial u}(t)\big(u^*(t) - u\big) \leq 0, \quad \forall u \in \mathbb{U}, a.s., \text{ for all } t \in [0, T]. \tag{2.16}$$

Then $u^*(\cdot)$ is an optimal control for **Problem (FBSOCPD)**.

Proof. For any $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[0, T]$, with the corresponding solutions $(X(\cdot), Y(\cdot), Z(\cdot))$ to (1.1) and (1.5), applying the Itô's formula to

$$\begin{aligned} & q(t)(Y^*(t) - Y(t)) + p_1(t)(X^*(t) - X(t)) \\ & + p_2(t) \int_{-\delta}^{0} e^{\lambda\tau}(X^*(t+\tau) - X(t+\tau)d\tau + p_3(t)(X^*(t-\delta) - X(t-\delta)), \end{aligned}$$

noting that

$$d\int_{-\delta}^{0} e^{\lambda\tau} X(t+\tau)d\tau = \Big[X(t) - e^{-\lambda\delta}X(t-\delta) - \lambda \int_{-\delta}^{0} e^{\lambda\tau} X(t+\tau)d\tau\Big]dt, \tag{2.17}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\big[q(T)(Y^*(T) - Y(T))\big] - \big[Y^*(0) - Y(0)\big] \\ & \quad - \mathbb{E}\big[Mq(T)(X^*(T) - X(T))\big] - \mathbb{E}\big[Nq(T)(X_1^*(T) - X_1(T))\big] \\ = & \ - \big[Y^*(0) - Y(0)\big] = J_r(0, \varphi; u^*(\cdot)) - J_r(0, \varphi; u(\cdot)) \\ = & \ \mathbb{E}\int_0^T \Big\{ p_1(t)\Big(\frac{\partial b^*}{\partial u}(t) - \frac{\partial b}{\partial u}(t, X(t), X_1(t), X_2(t), u(t))\Big) \\ & \qquad + k_1(t)\Big(\frac{\partial \sigma^*}{\partial u}(t) - \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial u}(t, X(t), X_1(t), X_2(t), u(t))\Big) \\ & \qquad - q(t)\Big(\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial u}(t) - \frac{\partial f}{\partial u}(t, X(t), X_1(t), Y(t), Z(t), u(t))\Big) \\ & \qquad - p_1(t)\frac{\partial b^*}{\partial x}(t)\big(X^*(t) - X(t)\big) - k_1(t)\frac{\partial \sigma^*}{\partial x}(t)\big(X^*(t) - X(t)\big) \\ & \qquad + q(t)\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial x}(t)\big(X^*(t) - X(t)\big) - p_1(t)\frac{\partial b^*}{\partial x_1}(t)\big(X_1^*(t) - X_1(t)\big) \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\qquad - k_1(t)\frac{\partial \sigma^*}{\partial x_1}(t)\big(X_1^*(t)-X_1(t)\big) + q(t)\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial x_1}(t)\big(X_1^*(t)-X_1(t)\big)\\
&\qquad - p_1(t)\frac{\partial b^*}{\partial x_2}(t)\big(X_2^*(t)-X_2(t)\big) - k_1(t)\frac{\partial \sigma^*}{\partial x_2}(t)\big(X_2^*(t)-X_2(t)\big)\\
&\qquad + q(t)\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial y}(t)\big(Y^*(t)-Y(t)\big) + q(t)\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial z}(t)\big(Z^*(t)-Z(t)\big)\bigg\}dt\\
&= \mathbb{E}\int_0^T \bigg\{H^*(t) - H(t,X(t),X_1(t),X_2(t),Y(t),Z(t),u(t),\vec{p}(t),q(t),\vec{k}(t))\\
&\qquad - \frac{\partial H^*}{\partial x}(t)\big(X^*(t)-X(t)\big) - \frac{\partial H^*}{\partial x_1}(t)\big(X_1^*(t)-X_1(t)\big)\\
&\qquad - \frac{\partial H^*}{\partial x_2}(t)\big(X_2^*(t)-X_2(t)\big) - \frac{\partial H^*}{\partial y}(t)\big(Y^*(t)-Y(t)\big)\\
&\qquad - \frac{\partial H^*}{\partial z}(t)\big(Z^*(t)-Z(t)\big)\bigg\}dt.
\end{aligned}
$$

In the above, we have used

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial b^*}{\partial \rho}(t) &= \frac{\partial b}{\partial \rho}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t),X_2^*(t),u^*(t)),\\
\frac{\partial \sigma^*}{\partial \rho}(t) &= \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial \rho}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t),X_2^*(t),u^*(t)),\\
\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial \rho}(t) &= \frac{\partial f}{\partial \rho}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t),Y^*(t),Z^*(t),u^*(t)),
\end{aligned}
$$

for $\rho = x, x_1, x_2, y, z, u$. By (2.13), that is $H(t,x,x_1,x_2,y,z,u,\vec{p}(t),q(t),\vec{k}(t))$ is convex with respect to (x,x_1,x_2,y,z,u), for all $t\in[0,T]$, we then have

$$
J_r(0,\varphi;u^*(\cdot)) - J_r(0,\varphi;u(\cdot)) \le \mathbb{E}\int_0^T \frac{\partial H^*}{\partial u}(t)\big(u^*(t)-u(t)\big)dt \le 0.
$$

Thus $u^*(\cdot)$ is really the optimal control for **Problem (FBSOCPD)**. The proof is complete. □

A drawback of the previous sufficient maximum principle in Theorem 2.5 is that the concavity conditions are not always satisfied in applications. In view of this, it is of interest to obtain conditions for an optimal control where the concavity is not needed. The following is a necessary maximum principle. For this target, we assume the following.

(H9) For all $u\in\mathcal{U}[0,T]$ and all bounded $\beta\in\mathcal{U}[0,T]$, there exists $\epsilon>0$ such that

$$
u+\varepsilon\beta\in\mathcal{U}[0,T],\ \text{for all}\ \varepsilon\in(-\epsilon,\epsilon).
$$

(H10) For all $t_0\in[0,T], h$ such that $t_0+h\in[t_0,T]$, and all bounded $\mathcal{F}_{t_0}^0$-measurable random variable α, the control process $\beta(t)$ defined by

$$
\beta(t) = \alpha\chi_{[t_0,t_0+h]}(t),\ t\in[0,T] \tag{2.18}
$$

belongs to $\mathcal{U}[0,T]$, where $\chi_{[t_0,t_0+h]}(t)$ is the indicator function on the set $[t_0,t_0+h]$.

(H11) For all bounded $\beta\in\mathcal{U}[0,T]$, the derivative processes

$$
\xi(t) := \frac{\partial}{\partial\varepsilon}X^{u+\varepsilon\beta}(t)|_{\varepsilon=0}, \tag{2.19}
$$

$$\eta(t) := \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} Y^{u+\varepsilon\beta}(t)|_{\varepsilon=0}, \tag{2.20}$$

$$\zeta(t) := \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} Z^{u+\varepsilon\beta}(t)|_{\varepsilon=0} \tag{2.21}$$

exist such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\int_0^T \bigg[\frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(t, X(t), X_1(t), X_2(t), u(t))\xi(t)\\
&\qquad + \frac{\partial b}{\partial x_1}(t, X(t), X_1(t), X_2(t), u(t))\int_{-\delta}^0 e^{\lambda\tau}\xi(t+\tau)d\tau\\
&\qquad + \frac{\partial b}{\partial x_2}(t, X(t), X_1(t), X_2(t), u(t))\xi(t-\delta)\\
&\qquad + \frac{\partial b}{\partial u}(t, X(t), X_1(t), X_2(t), u(t))\beta(t)\bigg]dt\\
&+\mathbb{E}\int_0^T \bigg[\frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(t, X(t), X_1(t), X_2(t), u(t))\xi(t)\\
&\qquad + \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x_1}(t, X(t), X_1(t), X_2(t), u(t))\int_{-\delta}^0 e^{\lambda\tau}\xi(t+\tau)d\tau\\
&\qquad + \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x_2}(t, X(t), X_1(t), X_2(t), u(t))\xi(t-\delta)\\
&\qquad + \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial u}(t, X(t), X_1(t), X_2(t), u(t))\beta(t)\bigg]dt\\
&+\mathbb{E}\int_0^T \bigg[\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(t, X(t), X_1(t), Y(t), Z(t), u(t))\xi(t)\\
&\qquad + \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}(t, X(t), X_1(t), Y(t), Z(t), u(t))\int_{-\delta}^0 e^{\lambda\tau}\xi(t+\tau)d\tau\\
&\qquad + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(t, X(t), X_1(t), Y(t), Z(t), u(t))\eta(t)\\
&\qquad + \frac{\partial f}{\partial z}(t, X(t), X_1(t), Y(t), Z(t), u(t))\zeta(t)\\
&\qquad + \frac{\partial f}{\partial u}(t, X(t), X_1(t), Y(t), Z(t), u(t))\beta(t)\bigg]dt\\
&+\mathbb{E}\bigg\{\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x}(X(T), X_1(T))\xi(T) + \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_1}(X(T), X_1(T))\int_{-\delta}^0 e^{\lambda\tau}\xi(T+\tau)d\tau\bigg\} < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} X_1^{u+\varepsilon\beta}(t)|_{\varepsilon=0} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon}\bigg(\int_{-\delta}^0 e^{\lambda\tau} X^{u+\varepsilon\beta}(t+\tau)d\tau\bigg)\Big|_{\varepsilon=0}\\
&= \int_{-\delta}^0 e^{\lambda\tau}\frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} X^{u+\varepsilon\beta}(t+\tau)\Big|_{\varepsilon=0} d\tau\\
&= \int_{t-\delta}^t e^{\lambda(t-\tau)}\frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} X^{u+\varepsilon\beta}(\tau)\Big|_{\varepsilon=0} d\tau\\
&= \int_{t-\delta}^t e^{\lambda(t-\tau)}\xi(\tau)d\tau = \int_{-\delta}^0 e^{\lambda\tau}\xi(t+\tau)d\tau
\end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\varepsilon}X_2^{u+\varepsilon\beta}(t)\Big|_{\varepsilon=0}=\frac{\partial}{\partial\varepsilon}X^{u+\varepsilon\beta}(t-\delta)\Big|_{\varepsilon=0}=\xi(t-\delta). \tag{2.23}$$

It then follows from (1.1) that the following *variational forward equation*

$$\begin{cases} d\xi(t)=\Big\{\dfrac{\partial b}{\partial x}(t,X(t),X_1(t),X_2(t),u(t))\xi(t)\\ \qquad\qquad +\dfrac{\partial b}{\partial x_1}(t,X(t),X_1(t),X_2(t),u(t))\displaystyle\int_{-\delta}^{0}e^{\lambda\tau}\xi(t+\tau)d\tau\\ \qquad\qquad +\dfrac{\partial b}{\partial x_2}(t,X(t),X_1(t),X_2(t),u(t))\xi(t-\delta)\\ \qquad\qquad +\dfrac{\partial b}{\partial u}(t,X(t),X_1(t),X_2(t),u(t))\beta(t)\Big\}dt\\ \qquad\quad +\Big\{\dfrac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(t,X(t),X_1(t),X_2(t),u(t))\xi(t)\\ \qquad\qquad +\dfrac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x_1}(t,X(t),X_1(t),X_2(t),u(t))\displaystyle\int_{-\delta}^{0}e^{\lambda\tau}\xi(t+\tau)d\tau\\ \qquad\qquad +\dfrac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x_2}(t,X(t),X_1(t),X_2(t),u(t))\xi(t-\delta)\\ \qquad\qquad +\dfrac{\partial \sigma}{\partial u}(t,X(t),X_1(t),X_2(t),u(t))\beta(t)\Big\}dW(t),\quad t\in[0,T],\\ \xi(t)=0,\ t\in[-\delta,0], \end{cases} \tag{2.24}$$

admits a unique $\mathcal{F}_t^0$-adapted solution $\xi(\cdot)$, and the following *variational backward equation*

$$\begin{cases} -d\eta(t)=\Big\{\dfrac{\partial f}{\partial x}(t,X(t),X_1(t),Y(t),Z(t),u(t))\xi(t)\\ \qquad\qquad +\dfrac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}(t,X(t),X_1(t),Y(t),Z(t),u(t))\displaystyle\int_{-\delta}^{0}e^{\lambda\tau}\xi(t+\tau)d\tau\\ \qquad\qquad +\dfrac{\partial f}{\partial y}(t,X(t),X_1(t),Y(t),Z(t),u(t))\eta(t)\\ \qquad\qquad +\dfrac{\partial f}{\partial z}(t,X(t),X_1(t),Y(t),Z(t),u(t))\zeta(t)\\ \qquad\qquad +\dfrac{\partial f}{\partial u}(t,X(t),X_1(t),Y(t),Z(t),u(t))\beta(t)\Big\}dt\\ \qquad\quad -\zeta(t)dW(t),\quad t\in[0,T],\\ \eta(T)=\dfrac{\partial \phi}{\partial x}(X(T),X_1(T))\xi(T)+\dfrac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_1}(X(T),X_1(T))\displaystyle\int_{-\delta}^{0}e^{\lambda\tau}\xi(T+\tau)d\tau, \end{cases} \tag{2.25}$$

admits a unique $\mathcal{F}_t^0$-adapted solution $(\eta(\cdot),\zeta(\cdot))$.

THEOREM 2.6. *(Necessary Maximum Principle) Let $u^*(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}[0,T]$, and $(X^*(\cdot), Y^*(\cdot),Z^*(\cdot))$ be the corresponding solutions to (1.1) and (1.5), adjoint processes $\vec{p}(\cdot)=(p_1(\cdot),p_2(\cdot),p_3(\cdot))^\top,q(t),\vec{k}(\cdot)=(k_1(\cdot),k_2(\cdot))^\top$ be the corresponding solutions to (2.12).*

The corresponding derivative processes $(\xi^*(\cdot),\eta^*(\cdot),\zeta^*(\cdot))$ *are given by the variational forward and backward equations (2.24) and (2.25). Assume that*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\int_0^T &\Big\{p_1^2(t)\Big[\Big|\frac{\partial\sigma^*}{\partial x}(t)\Big|^2\xi^{*2}(t)+\Big|\frac{\partial\sigma^*}{\partial y}(t)\Big|^2\Big|\int_{-\delta}^0 e^{\lambda\tau}\xi^*(t+\tau)d\tau\Big|^2\\ &\qquad+\Big|\frac{\partial\sigma^*}{\partial z}(t)\Big|^2\xi^{*2}(t-\delta)+\Big|\frac{\partial\sigma^*}{\partial u}(t)\Big|^2\beta^2(t)\Big]\\ &+q^2(t)\zeta^{*2}(t)+k_1^2(t)\xi^{*2}(t)+k_2^2(t)\Big|\int_{-\delta}^0 e^{\lambda\tau}\xi^*(t+\tau)d\tau\Big|^2\\ &+\eta^{*2}(t)\Big|\frac{\partial H^*}{\partial z}(t)\Big|^2\Big\}dt<\infty.\end{aligned}$$

Then the following assertions are equivalent:

$$(i)\ \frac{\partial}{\partial\varepsilon}J_r(u^*+\varepsilon\beta)\Big|_{\varepsilon=0}=0 \text{ for all bounded } \beta\in\mathcal{U}[0,T];\tag{2.26}$$

$$\begin{aligned}(ii)\ \frac{\partial H^*}{\partial u}\big(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t),X_2^*(t),Y^*(t),Z^*(t),u,\vec{p}(t),q(t),\vec{k}(t)\big)\Big|_{u=u^*(t)}&=0,\\ a.s., \text{ for all } t\in[0,T].&\end{aligned}\tag{2.27}$$

Proof. Suppose that (i) holds. Then

$$0=\frac{\partial}{\partial\varepsilon}J_r(0,x,x_1;u^*+\varepsilon\beta)\Big|_{\varepsilon=0}=-\eta(0).\tag{2.28}$$

Applying the Itô's formula to $q(t)\eta(t)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\Big\{q(T)\Big(\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial x}(X^*(T),X_1^*(T))\xi^*(T)\\ &\quad+\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial x_1}(X^*(T),X_1^*(T))\int_{-\delta}^0 e^{\lambda\tau}\xi^*(T+\tau)d\tau\Big)\Big\}-\eta(0)\\ =&-\mathbb{E}\int_0^T\Big\{q(t)\Big(\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial x}(t)\xi^*(t)+\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial x_1}(t)\int_{-\delta}^0 e^{\lambda\tau}\xi^*(t+\tau)d\tau+\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial u}(t)\beta(t)\Big)\Big\}dt.\end{aligned}\tag{2.29}$$

Substituting (2.29) into (2.28), we get

$$\begin{aligned}0=&-\mathbb{E}\Big\{q(T)\Big(\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial x}(X^*(T),X_1^*(T))\xi^*(T)\\ &\quad+\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial x_1}(X^*(T),X_1^*(T))\int_{-\delta}^0 e^{\lambda\tau}\xi^*(T+\tau)d\tau\Big)\Big\}\\ &-\mathbb{E}\int_0^T\Big\{q(t)\Big(\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial x}(t)\xi^*(t)+\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial x_1}(t)\int_{-\delta}^0 e^{\lambda\tau}\xi^*(t+\tau)d\tau+\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial u}(t)\beta(t)\Big)\Big\}dt.\end{aligned}\tag{2.30}$$

Applying again Itô's formula to

$$p_1(t)\xi^*(t)+p_2(t)\int_{-\delta}^0 e^{\lambda\tau}\xi^*(t+\tau)d\tau+p_3(t)\xi^*(t-\delta),$$

and noting that

$$d\int_{-\delta}^{0} e^{\lambda\tau}\xi^*(t+\tau)d\tau = \Big[\xi^*(t) - e^{-\lambda\delta}\xi^*(t-\delta) - \lambda\int_{-\delta}^{0} e^{\lambda\tau}\xi^*(t+\tau)d\tau\Big]dt,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\mathbb{E}\Big\{q(T)\Big(\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial x}(X^*(T),X_1^*(T))\xi^*(T)\\
&\qquad+\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial x_1}(X^*(T),X_1^*(T))\int_{-\delta}^{0}e^{\lambda\tau}\xi^*(T+\tau)d\tau\Big)\Big\}\\
&=\mathbb{E}\int_0^T\Big\{q(t)\Big(\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial x}(t)\xi^*(t)+\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial x_1}(t)\int_{-\delta}^{0}e^{\lambda\tau}\xi^*(t+\tau)d\tau\Big)\\
&\qquad+\Big(p_1(t)\frac{\partial b^*}{\partial u}(t)+k_1(t)\frac{\partial\sigma^*}{\partial u}(t)\Big)\beta(t)\Big\}dt.
\end{aligned}\tag{2.31}$$

Combining (2.30) with (2.31), noting that the definition of H in (2.11), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
0=&\,\mathbb{E}\int_0^T\Big(p_1(t)\frac{\partial b^*}{\partial u}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t),X_2^*(t),u^*(t))\\
&\qquad+k_1(t)\frac{\partial\sigma^*}{\partial u}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t),X_2^*(t),u^*(t))\\
&\qquad-q(t)\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial u}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t),Y^*(t),Z^*(t),u^*(t))\Big)\beta(t)dt\\
=&\,\mathbb{E}\int_0^T\frac{\partial H^*}{\partial u}(t)\beta(t)dt.
\end{aligned}\tag{2.32}$$

By (H10), if we apply (2.32) to

$$\beta(t)=\alpha(\omega)\chi_{[s,s+h]}(t),\ t\in[0,T],$$

where $t_0\in[0,T], h$ such that $t_0+h\in[t_0,T]$, $s\geq t_0$, $\alpha(\omega)$ is bounded and $\mathcal{F}_{t_0}^0$-measurable, we get

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\int_s^{s+h}\frac{\partial H^*}{\partial u}(t)dt\Big)\alpha\Big]=0.$$

Differentiating with respect to s, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\frac{\partial H^*}{\partial u}(s)\Big)\alpha\Big]=0.$$

Since this holds for all $s\geq t_0$ and all $\mathcal{F}_{t_0}^0$-measurable bounded α, we conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\frac{\partial H^*}{\partial u}(t_0)\Big|\mathcal{F}_{t_0}^0\Big]=0,\ a.s.$$

This shows that (i)⇒(ii) by the adaptability.

Conversely, since every bounded $\beta\in\mathcal{U}[0,T]$ can be approximated by linear combinations of controls β of the form (2.18), we can prove (ii)⇒(i) by reversing the above argument. The proof is complete. □

3. Relationship between Dynamic Programming Principle and Maximum Principle. In this section, we investigate the relationship between dynamic programming principle (the generalized HJB equation) and maximum principle. The main result is this section is that we find the connection between the value function V, adjoint processes $\vec{p},\vec{q}$ and the generalized Hamiltonian function G, which is stated in the following theorem.

THEOREM 3.1. *Let (H1)$\sim$(H11) hold and $(s,x,x_1)\in[0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^2$ be fixed. Suppose that $u^*(\cdot)$ is an optimal control for* **Problem (FBSOCPD)** *and $(X^*(\cdot),Y^*(\cdot),Z^*(\cdot))$ is the corresponding optimal state which is the solutions to (1.1) and (1.5). Let $\vec{p}(\cdot)=(p_1(\cdot),p_2(\cdot),p_3(\cdot))^\top, q(t), \vec{k}(\cdot)=(k_1(\cdot),k_2(\cdot))^\top$ be the solution to adjoint equation (2.12). Assume that the value function V_r depends on (s,x,x_1) only and $V_r(s,x,x_1)\in C^{1,2,1}([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^2)$, then*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial t}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\\
&=G\big(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t),X_2^*(t),u^*(t),-V_r(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t)),-\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t)),\\
&\qquad-\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t)),-\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\big)\\
&=\max_{u\in\mathbf{U}}G\big(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t),X_2^*(t),u,-V_r(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t)),-\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t)),\\
&\qquad\qquad-\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t)),-\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\big),\quad a.e. t\in[s,T],a.s.
\end{aligned}\tag{3.1}$$

Further, if $V_r(s,x,x_1)\in C^{1,3,2}([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial t\partial x},\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial t\partial x_1},\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x\partial x_1},\frac{\partial^3 V_r}{\partial x^2\partial x_1}$ are also continuous, then

$$\begin{cases}
p_1(t)=\dfrac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))q(t),\quad \forall t\in[s,T],a.s.,\\
k_1(t)=\Big[\dfrac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\sigma^*(t)+\dfrac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\dfrac{\partial f^*}{\partial z}(t)\Big)\Big]q(t),\\
\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad a.e. t\in[s,T],a.s.,\\
p_2(t)=\dfrac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))q(t),\quad \forall t\in[s,T],a.s.,\\
k_2(t)=\Big[\dfrac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x\partial x_1}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\sigma^*(t)+\dfrac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\dfrac{\partial f^*}{\partial z}(t)\Big)\Big]q(t),\\
\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad a.e. t\in[s,T],a.s.,\\
q(t)=\exp\Big\{\displaystyle\int_s^t\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial y}(r)-\frac{1}{2}\Big|\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial z}(r)\Big|^2dr\Big\},\quad \forall t\in[s,T],a.s.,
\end{cases}\tag{3.2}$$

where for notational simplicity, we have used in this section, for all $t\in[s,T]$,

$$\begin{cases}
b^*(t)\equiv b(t,X^*(t),Y^*(t),Z^*(t),u^*(t)),\\
\sigma^*(t)\equiv\sigma(t,X^*(t),Y^*(t),Z^*(t),u^*(t)),\\
\dfrac{\partial f^*}{\partial y}(t)\equiv\dfrac{\partial f}{\partial z}\Big(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t),-V_r(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t),\dfrac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\sigma^*(t),u^*(t)\Big),\\
\dfrac{\partial f^*}{\partial z}(t)\equiv\dfrac{\partial f}{\partial z}\Big(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t),-V_r(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t),\dfrac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\sigma^*(t),u^*(t)\Big).
\end{cases}$$

For simplicity, in this section we write $X = X^{s,\varphi;u}$ and $X^* = X^{s,\varphi;u^*}$, etc.

Proof. By the generalized dynamic programming principle (2.7), it is easy to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
&V_r(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t)) = -Y^*(t)\\
&= -\mathbb{E}^{s,x,x_1;u^*}\bigg[\int_t^T f\big(r, X^*(r), X_1^*(r), Y^*(r), Z^*(r), u^*(r)\big)dr\\
&\qquad\qquad + \phi(X^*(T), X_1^*(T))\bigg],\ t \in [s,T].
\end{aligned}$$

Define a square-integrable $\mathcal{F}_t^s$-martingale (recall that $s \in [0,T)$ is fixed)

$$\begin{aligned}
m(t) :=\ & -\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_s^T f\big(r, X^*(r), X_1^*(r), Y^*(r), Z^*(r), u^*(r)\big)dr\\
&\qquad + \phi(X^*(T), X_1^*(T))\Big|\mathcal{F}_t^s\Big],\ t \in [s,T].
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by the martingale representation theorem (see, for example, Yong and Zhou [33]), there exists a unique $M(\cdot) \in L^2_{\mathcal{F}}([s,T];\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$m(t) = m(s) + \int_s^t M(r)dW(r) = V(s,x,x_1) + \int_s^t M(r)dW(r), \quad t \in [s,T].$$

So

$$\begin{aligned}
V(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t)) =\ & -\int_t^T f\big(r, X^*(r), X_1^*(r), Y^*(r), Z^*(r), u^*(r)\big)dr\\
& -\int_s^T M(r)dW(r) + V_r(T, X^*(T), X_1^*(T)).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, applying the Itô's formula (Lemma 2.3) to $V_r(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t))$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&dV_r(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t))\\
&= \bigg\{\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial t}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t)) + b^*(t)\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t))\\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^{*2}(t)\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t))\\
&\quad + \big(X^*(t) - \lambda X_1^*(t) - e^{-\lambda\delta}X_2^*(t)\big)\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t))\bigg\}dt\\
&+ \sigma^*(t)\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t))dW(t).
\end{aligned}$$

Comparing the above two equations, we conclude that

$$\begin{cases}
\dfrac{\partial V_r}{\partial t}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t)) + b^*(t)\dfrac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t))\\
\quad + \dfrac{1}{2}\sigma^{*2}(t)\dfrac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t))\\
\quad + \big(X^*(t) - \lambda X_1^*(t) - e^{-\lambda\delta}X_2^*(t)\big)\dfrac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t))\\
= f\big(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t), Y^*(t), Z^*(t), u^*(t)\big), \quad \forall t \in [s,T], a.s.,\\
\sigma^*(t)\dfrac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t)) = M(t), \quad a.e.\ t \in [s,T], a.s.
\end{cases} \tag{3.3}$$

However, by the uniqueness of solution to BSDDE (1.5), we have

$$\begin{cases} Y^*(t) = -V_r(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t)), \\ Z^*(t) = -\dfrac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t))\sigma^*(t), \quad a.e.\ t \in [s,T], a.s. \end{cases}$$

Since $V_r(s, x, x_1) \in C^{1,2,1}([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^2)$, it satisfies the generalized HJB equation (2.5), which implies (3.1). Also, by (2.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = &-\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial t}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t)) + G\Big(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t), X_2^*(t), u^*(t), -V_r(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t)), \\ &\quad -\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t)), -\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t)), -\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t))\Big) \\ \geq &-\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial t}(t, x, X_1^*(t)) + G\Big(t, x, X_1^*(t), X_2^*(t), u, -V_r(t, x, X_1^*(t)), \\ &\quad -\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t, x, X_1^*(t)), -\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(t, x, X_1^*(t)), -\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(t, x, X_1^*(t))\Big), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, if $V_r \in C^{1,3,2}([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^2)$ and $\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial t \partial x}, \frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x \partial x_1}$ are continuous, then

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\Big\{ -\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial t}(t, x, X_1^*(t)) + G\Big(t, x, X_1^*(t), X_2^*(t), u, -V_r(t, x, X_1^*(t)), \\ &\qquad -\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t, x, X_1^*(t)), -\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(t, x, X_1^*(t)), -\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(t, x, X_1^*(t))\Big)\Big\}\Big|_{x = X^*(t)} \\ &= 0,\ \forall t \in [s,T]. \end{aligned}$$

This is equivalent to (recall the definition of G (2.6))

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = &-\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial t \partial x}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t)) - \frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t)) b^*(t) \\ &- \frac{\partial V}{\partial x}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t))\frac{\partial b^*}{\partial x}(t) - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^{*2}(t)\frac{\partial^3 V_r}{\partial x^3}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t)) \\ &- \frac{\partial \sigma^*}{\partial x}(t)\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t))\sigma^*(t) - \frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t)) \\ &- \big(X^*(t) - \lambda X_1^*(t) - e^{-\lambda\delta} X_2^*(t)\big)\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x \partial x_1}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t)) \\ &+ \frac{\partial f^*}{\partial x}(t) - \frac{\partial f^*}{\partial y}(t)\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t)) \\ &- \frac{\partial f^*}{\partial z}(t)\Big[\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t))\sigma^*(t) \\ &\qquad\qquad + \frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t))\frac{\partial \sigma^*}{\partial x}(t)\Big],\ \forall t \in [s,T]. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, applying the Itô's formula to $\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
&d\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\\
=&\bigg\{\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial t\partial x}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))+\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))b^*(t)\\
&+\frac{1}{2}\sigma^{*2}(t)\frac{\partial^3 V_r}{\partial x^3}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\\
&+\big(X^*(t)-\lambda X_1^*(t)-e^{-\lambda\delta}X_2^*(t)\big)\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x\partial x_1}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\bigg\}dt\\
&+\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\sigma^*(t)dW(t)\\
=&\bigg\{-\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\frac{\partial b^*}{\partial x}(t)-\frac{\partial \sigma^*}{\partial x}(t)\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\sigma^*(t)\\
&-\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))+\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial x}(t)-\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial y}(t)\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\\
&-\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial z}(t)\bigg[\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\sigma^*(t)+\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\frac{\partial \sigma^*}{\partial x}(t)\bigg]\bigg\}dt\\
&+\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\sigma^*(t)dW(t).
\end{aligned}
$$

Applying again the Itô's formula to $\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))q(t)$, noting that

$$\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(T,X^*(T),X_1^*(T))=-\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x}(X^*(T),X_1^*(T)),$$

we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&d\bigg\{\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))q(t)\bigg\}\\
=&\bigg\{-\frac{\partial b^*}{\partial x}(t)\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))q(t)\\
&-\frac{\partial \sigma^*}{\partial x}(t)\bigg[\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\sigma^*(t)+\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial z}(t)\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\bigg]q(t)\\
&-\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))q(t)+\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial x}(t)q(t)\bigg\}dt\\
&+\bigg[\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\sigma^*(t)+\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial z}(t)\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\bigg]q(t)dW(t).
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence, by the uniqueness of the solution to the $p_1(t)$ part of adjoint equation (2.12), we have

$$
\begin{cases}
p_1(t)=\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))q(t),\quad \forall t\in[s,T],a.s.,\\
k_1(t)=\bigg[\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\sigma^*(t)+\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial z}(t)\Big)\bigg]q(t),\\
\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad a.e.t\in[s,T],a.s.
\end{cases}
\tag{3.4}
$$

Similarly, by (2.5) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 = & -\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial t}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t)) + G\Big(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t), X_2^*(t), u^*(t), -V_r(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t)),\\
& \quad -\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t)), -\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t)), -\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t))\Big)\\
\geq & -\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial t}(t, X^*(t), x_1) + G\Big(t, X^*(t), x_1, X_2^*(t), u, -V_r(t, X^*(t), x_1),\\
& \quad -\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t, X^*(t), x_1), -\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(t, X^*(t), x_1), -\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(t, X^*(t), x_1)\Big), \quad \forall x_1 \in \mathbb{R}.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, if $V_r \in C^{1,3,2}([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^2)$ and $\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial t \partial x_1}, \frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x \partial x_1}$ are continuous, then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}\Big\{ -\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial t}(t, X^*(t), x_1) + G\Big(t, X^*(t), x_1, X_2^*(t), u, -V_r(t, X^*(t), x_1),\\
& \quad -\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t, X^*(t), x_1), -\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(t, X^*(t), x_1), -\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(t, X^*(t), x_1)\Big)\Big\}\Big|_{x_1 = X_1^*(t)}\\
& = 0, \ \forall t \in [s, T].
\end{aligned}$$

This is equivalent to (recall the definition of G (2.6))

$$\begin{aligned}
0 = & -\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial t \partial x_1}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t)) - \frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x \partial x_1}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t)) b^*(t)\\
& - \frac{\partial V}{\partial x}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t)) \frac{\partial b^*}{\partial x_1}(t) - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^{*2}(t) \frac{\partial^3 V_r}{\partial x^2 \partial x_1}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t))\\
& - \frac{\partial \sigma^*}{\partial x_1}(t) \frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t)) \sigma^*(t) + \lambda \frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t))\\
& - \big(X^*(t) - \lambda X_1^*(t) - e^{-\lambda\delta} X_2^*(t)\big) \frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x_1^2}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t))\\
& + \frac{\partial f^*}{\partial x_1}(t) - \frac{\partial f^*}{\partial y}(t) \frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t))\\
& - \frac{\partial f^*}{\partial z}(t) \bigg[\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x \partial x_1}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t)) \sigma^*(t)\\
& \qquad\qquad + \frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t)) \frac{\partial \sigma^*}{\partial x_1}(t) \bigg], \ \forall t \in [s, T].
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, applying the Itô's formula to $\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
&d\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\\
=&\bigg\{\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial t\partial x_1}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))+\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x\partial x_1}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))b^*(t)\\
&\quad+\frac{1}{2}\sigma^{*2}(t)\frac{\partial^3 V_r}{\partial x^2\partial x_1}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\\
&\quad+\big(X^*(t)-\lambda X_1^*(t)-e^{-\lambda\delta}X_2^*(t)\big)\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x_1^2}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\bigg\}dt\\
&+\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x\partial x_1}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\sigma^*(t)dW(t)\\
=&\bigg\{-\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\frac{\partial b^*}{\partial x_1}(t)-\frac{\partial \sigma^*}{\partial x_1}(t)\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\sigma^*(t)\\
&\quad+\lambda\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))+\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial x_1}(t)-\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial y}(t)\frac{\partial V}{\partial x_1}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\\
&-\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial z}(t)\bigg[\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x\partial x_1}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\sigma^*(t)+\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\frac{\partial \sigma^*}{\partial x_1}(t)\bigg]\bigg\}dt\\
&+\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x\partial x_1}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\sigma^*(t)dW(t).
\end{aligned}
$$

Applying again the Itô's formula to $\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))q(t)$, noting that

$$
\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(T,X^*(T),X_1^*(T))=-\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_1}(X^*(T),X_1^*(T)),
$$

we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&d\bigg\{\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))q(t)\bigg\}\\
=&\bigg\{-\frac{\partial b^*}{\partial x_1}(t)\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))q(t)\\
&\quad-\frac{\partial \sigma^*}{\partial x_1}(t)\bigg[\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\sigma^*(t)+\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial z}(t)\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\bigg]q(t)\\
&\quad+\lambda\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))q(t)+\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial x_1}(t)q(t)\bigg\}dt\\
&+\bigg[\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x\partial x_1}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\sigma^*(t)+\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial z}(t)\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\bigg]q(t)dW(t).
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence, by the uniqueness of the solution to the $p_2(t)$ part of adjoint equation (2.12), we have

$$
\begin{cases}
p_2(t)=\dfrac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))q(t),\quad \forall t\in[s,T],a.s.,\\
k_2(t)=\bigg[\dfrac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x\partial x_1}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\sigma^*(t)+\dfrac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(t,X^*(t),X_1^*(t))\dfrac{\partial f^*}{\partial z}(t)\Big)\bigg]q(t),\\
\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad a.e.t\in[s,T],a.s.
\end{cases}
\tag{3.5}
$$

And finally

$$q(t)=\exp\left\{\int_s^t \frac{\partial f^*}{\partial y}(r)-\frac{1}{2}\left|\frac{\partial f^*}{\partial z}(r)\right|^2dr\right\},\quad \forall t\in[s,T],a.s.,\tag{3.6}$$

can be easily obtained by solving the forward equation of $q(t)$ directly. The proof is complete. □

4. Application to Consumption and Portfolio Optimization with Recursive Utility and Bounded Memory. In this section, we discuss a consumption and portfolio optimization problem with recursive utility and bounded memory in the financial market. The financial framework in this problem is initiated introduced by Chang et al. [4], with classical cost functional. In this paper, we generalize their model to the case with recursive utility. The optimal portfolio and consumption strategies are obtained by both dynamic programming and maximum principle approaches, in the meanwhile the relations we obtained in Theorem 3.1 are illustrated.

Let us first describe the environment of the financial market. Consider an investor who can invest his money into a risky asset and a riskless asset. The risky asset can be a stock, a mutual fund, etc. The riskless asset earns a fixed interest rate $r>0$. We can treat the money invested on the riskless asset as money deposited into a bank account. We assume that the investor can consume his/her wealth.

Let $U(t)$ be the amount invested on the risky asset and $V(t)$ is the amount invested on the riskless asset. The total wealth is given by $X(t)=U(t)+V(t)$. We consider the situation in which the performance of the risky asset has some memory (delay). Because many investors will look at an asset's past performance before they invest their money on the asset, the increasing investment performance of their wealth in the past tends to drive the investors to invest more on the risky asset, hence it can push the price of the risky asset even higher. On the other hand, if the price has been decreasing a lot, investors tend to sell the asset and invest on other assets, which will drive the price to go down further. To describe this phenomenon, we assume that the performance of the risky asset depends on the following delay variables $X_1(t)$ and $X_2(t)$:

$$X_1(t)=\int_{-\delta}^0 e^{\lambda\tau}X(t+\tau)d\tau,\quad X_2(t)=X(t-\delta),\ t\in[s,T],\tag{4.1}$$

for any initial time $s\in[0,T)$. Here λ is a constant and $\delta>0$ is the delay parameter. The parameter δ gives us the duration of the past that the investor usually cares about.

Let $\{W(t),t\geq 0\}$ be a one-dimensional standard Brownian motion defined on a complete probability space $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{P})$. We assume that the filtration $\mathcal{F}_t^0=\sigma\{W(\tau);0\leq\tau\leq t\}$ is augmented by all the $\mathbb{P}$-null sets in $\mathcal{F}$.

We assume that $U(t)$ and $V(t)$ follow the stochastic differential equations:

$$dU(t)=\big[\mu_0U(t)+\mu_1X_1(t)+\mu_2X_2(t)\big]dt+\sigma U(t)dW(t),\tag{4.2}$$

$$dV(t)=\big[rV(t)-C(t)\big]dt,\tag{4.3}$$

where μ_0,μ_1,μ_2 and σ are positive constants, and $C(t)$ is the consumption rate.

Add them together, and use the fact that $X(t) = U(t) + V(t)$, then we get the equation for the wealth $X(t)$:

$$\begin{cases} dX(t) = \big[\mu_0 U(t) + \mu_1 X_1(t) + \mu_2 X_2(t) + rV(t) - C(t)\big]dt \\ \qquad\qquad + \sigma U(t)dW(t),\ t \in [0,T], \\ X(t) = \varphi(t),\ t \in [-\delta, 0], \end{cases} \tag{4.4}$$

where continuous function $\varphi : [-\delta, 0] \to \mathbb{R}$ is the initial condition for information about $X(t)$ for $t \in [-\delta, 0]$.

Further, instead of $U(t)$ and $C(t)$, we use $c(t) \equiv C(t)/X(t)$ and $u(t) \equiv U(t)/X(t)$ as our consumption and portfolio control, respectively (note that $X(t) > 0$, a.s. is proved in Lemma 2.2 of Chang et al. [4]). It is easy to see that $V(t) = X(t) - U(t) = X(t)(1 - u(t))$. Now we can rewrite the equation for $X(t)$ as

$$\begin{cases} dX(t) = \big[((\mu_0 - r)u(t) - c(t) + r)X(t) + \mu_1 X_1(t) + \mu_2 X_2(t)\big]dt \\ \qquad\qquad + \sigma u(t)X(t)dW(t),\ t \in [s,T], \\ X(t) = \varphi(t) > 0,\ t \in [-\delta, 0]. \end{cases} \tag{4.5}$$

Now we define the admissible control space Π for the control variables $u(t)$ and $c(t)$:

Definition 4.1. *(Admissible Control Space) A control strategy* $(u(t), c(t))$ *is said to be in the admissible control space* Π *if it satisfies the following conditions:*

(*i*) $(u(t), c(t))$ *is* $\mathcal{F}_t$*-adapted processes*;

(*ii*) $c(t) \geq 0, \forall t \in [0,T]$;

(*iii*) *For any* $t \in [0,T]$, *we have*

$$|u(t)X(t)| \leq \Lambda_1 |X(t) + \mu_2 X_1(t)|, \quad |c(t)X(t)| \leq \Lambda_2 |X(t) + \mu_2 X_1(t)|,$$

where $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2 > 0$ *are positive constants.*

The investor wants to minimize the following recursive utility

$$J_r(u(\cdot), c(\cdot)) := -Y(t)\big|_{t=0}, \tag{4.6}$$

over the admissible control space Π, where

$$\begin{cases} -dY(t) = \big[-\beta Y(t) + \dfrac{1}{\gamma}\big(c(t)X(t)\big)^{\gamma}\big]dt - Z(t)dW(t), \quad t \in [0,T], \\ Y(T) = \dfrac{1}{\gamma}\big(X(T) + \theta X_1(T)\big)^{\gamma}. \end{cases} \tag{4.7}$$

and $\beta \geq 0, \gamma \in (-\infty, 1), \gamma \neq 0, \theta \in \mathbb{R}$ are constants.

Remark. The recursive utility functional defined in (4.7) with generator

$$f(t, x, x_1, y, z, u, c) = -\beta y + \frac{1}{\gamma}(cx)^{\gamma}, \tag{4.8}$$

stands for some standard additive utility of recursive type. It can be easily checked that f defined above is concave with respect to (c, y) and increasing with respect to c, which are classical properties that utility functions must satisfy. Recursive utility like (4.8) is meaningful and nontrivial generalization of the classical additive utility and has many applications in mathematical economics and mathematical finance.

For more detail about recursive utilities, see Duffie and Epstein [7], Section 1.4 of El Karoui et al. [8] or Schroder and Skiadas [26].

Since we are going to involve the dynamic programming principle, we will adopt the formulation as in Section 2. For given $(s,\varphi)\in[0,T)\times C([-\delta,0];\mathbb{R})$ and admissible control $(u(\cdot),c(\cdot))$, the wealth equation is

$$\begin{cases} dX^{s,\varphi;u,c}(t)=\Big\{\big[(\mu_0-r)u(t)-c(t)+r\big]X^{s,\varphi;u,c}(t)+\mu_1X_1^{s,\varphi;u,c}(t)\\ \qquad\qquad +\mu_2X_2^{s,\varphi;u,c}(t)\Big\}dt+\sigma u(t)X^{s,\varphi;u,c}(t)dW(t),\ t\in[s,T],\\ X^{s,\varphi;u,c}(t)=\varphi(t)>0,\ t\in[-\delta,0]. \end{cases} \tag{4.9}$$

and the recursive utility functional is defined as

$$J_r(s,\varphi;u(\cdot),c(\cdot))=-Y^{s,\varphi;u,c}(t)\big|_{t=s}, \tag{4.10}$$

where

$$\begin{cases} -dY^{s,\varphi;u,c}(t)=\Big\{-\beta Y^{s,\varphi;u,c}(t)+\frac{1}{\gamma}\big(c(t)X^{s,\varphi;u,c}(t)\big)^{\gamma}\Big\}dt\\ \qquad\qquad -Z^{s,\varphi;u,c}(t)dW(t),\ t\in[s,T],\\ Y^{s,\varphi;u,c}(T)=\frac{1}{\gamma}\big(X^{s,\varphi;u,c}(T)+\theta X_1^{s,\varphi;u,c}(T)\big)^{\gamma}. \end{cases} \tag{4.11}$$

This problem can be reformulated as follows. The state process $(X^{s,\varphi;u,c}(\cdot),Y^{s,\varphi;u,c}(\cdot),Z^{s,\varphi;u,c}(\cdot))$ of our system is described by the following coupled FBSDDE

$$\begin{cases} dX^{s,\varphi;u,c}(t)=\Big\{\big[(\mu_0-r)u(t)-c(t)+r\big]X^{s,\varphi;u,c}(t)+\mu_1X_1^{s,\varphi;u,c}(t)\\ \qquad\qquad +\mu_2X_2^{s,\varphi;u,c}(t)\Big\}dt+\sigma u(t)X^{s,\varphi;u,c}(t)dW(t),\\ -dY^{s,\varphi;u,c}(t)=\Big\{-\beta Y^{s,\varphi;u,c}(t)+\frac{1}{\gamma}\big(c(t)X^{s,\varphi;u,c}(t)\big)^{\gamma}\Big\}dt\\ \qquad\qquad -Z^{s,\varphi;u,c}(t)dW(t),\ t\in[s,T],\\ X^{s,\varphi;u,c}(t)=\varphi(t)>0,\ t\in[s-\delta,s],\\ Y^{s,\varphi;u,c}(T)=\frac{1}{\gamma}\big(X^{s,\varphi;u,c}(T)+\theta X_1^{s,\varphi;u,c}(T)\big)^{\gamma}, \end{cases} \tag{4.12}$$

and the cost functional is given of the form

$$\begin{aligned} J_r(s,\varphi;u(\cdot),c(\cdot))&=-Y^{s,\varphi;u,c}(s)\\ =\mathbb{E}^{s,\varphi;u,c}\Big\{\int_s^T&\Big[-\beta Y^{s,\varphi;u,c}(t)+\frac{1}{\gamma}\big(c(t)X^{s,\varphi;u,c}(t)\big)^{\gamma}\Big]dt\\ &+\frac{1}{\gamma}\big(X^{s,\varphi;u,c}(T)+\theta X_1^{s,\varphi;u,c}(T)\big)^{\gamma}\Big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

The consumption and portfolio optimization problem is to find an admissible $(u^*(\cdot),c^*(\cdot))$ such that

$$V_r(s,\varphi)=J_r(s,\varphi;u^*(\cdot),c^*(\cdot))=\operatorname*{essinf}_{(u(\cdot),c(\cdot))\in\Pi}J_r(s,\varphi;u(\cdot),c(\cdot)), \tag{4.14}$$

for all $(s,\varphi)\in[0,T)\times C([-\delta,0];\mathbb{R})$.

We can see that we are now in the finite dimensional space such that the value function V_r only depends on (s, x, x_1), i.e.,

$$V_r(s, \varphi) = V_r(s, x, x_1, x_2) = V_r(s, x, x_1), \tag{4.15}$$

where $V_r : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} x &= x(\varphi) \equiv \varphi(0), \\ y &= y(\varphi) \equiv \int_{\delta}^{0} e^{\lambda\tau} \varphi(\tau) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

And all the assumptions in Section 2 are satisfied. Then we can use both dynamic programming (Theorem 2.4) and maximum principle (Theorems 2.5 and 2.6) approaches to solve this problem.

4.1. Dynamic Programming Approach. In this subsection, we solve the above consumption and portfolio optimization problem, applying Bellman's dynamic programming approach. The main mathematical tool is Theorems 2.4, that is, the generalized HJB equation (2.5).

In this case, the generalized HJB equation (2.5) that the value function of the form $V(s, x, x_1)$ should satisfy, reduces to

$$\begin{cases} -\dfrac{\partial V_r}{\partial s}(s, x, x_1) = & \max\limits_{u} \left\{ \dfrac{1}{2}\sigma^2 u^2 x^2 \dfrac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(s, x, x_1) + (\mu_0 - r)ux \dfrac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(s, x, x_1) \right\} \\ & + \max\limits_{c \geq 0} \left\{ -cx \dfrac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(s, x, x_1) + \dfrac{1}{\gamma} c^\gamma x^\gamma \right\} \\ & + (rx + \mu_1 x_1 + \mu_2 x_2) \dfrac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(s, x, x_1) \\ & + (x - \lambda x_1 - e^{-\lambda\delta} x_2) \dfrac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(s, x, x_1) - \beta V_r(s, x, x_1), \quad \forall x_2 \in \mathbb{R}, \\ V_r(T, x, x_2) = & -\dfrac{1}{\gamma}\big(x + \theta x_1\big)^\gamma, \end{cases} \tag{4.16}$$

By (4.16), the candidate for the optimal consumption and portfolio strategies is

$$\begin{aligned} u^*(s) \equiv u^*(s, x, x_1) = & -\frac{(\mu_0 - r)\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(s, x, x_1)}{\sigma^2 x \frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(s, x, x_1)}, \\ c^*(s) \equiv c^*(s, x, x_1) = & \ \frac{\left[\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(s, x, x_1)\right]^{\frac{1}{\gamma - 1}}}{x}. \end{aligned}$$

Plug these into (4.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \beta V_r(s, x, x_1) - \frac{\partial V_r}{\partial s}(s, x, x_1) \\ = & -\frac{1}{2} \frac{(\mu_0 - r)^2 \left[\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(s, x, x_1)\right]^2}{\sigma^2 \frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(s, x, x_1)} + \Big(\frac{1}{\gamma} - 1\Big)\Big[\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(s, x, x_1)\Big]^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma - 1}} \\ & + (rx + \mu_1 x_1 + \mu_2 x_2) \frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(s, x, x_1) \\ & + (x - \lambda x_1 - e^{-\lambda\delta} x_2) \frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(s, x, x_1), \quad \forall x_2 \in \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned}$$

It can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\beta V_r(s,x,x_1)-\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial s}(s,x,x_1)\\
=&-\frac{1}{2}\frac{(\mu_0-r)^2\big[\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(s,x,x_1)\big]^2}{\sigma^2\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(s,x,x_1)}+\Big(\frac{1}{\gamma}-1\Big)\Big[\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(s,x,x_1)\Big]^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}\\
&+(rx+\mu_1x_1)\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(s,x,x_1)+(x-\lambda x_1)\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(s,x,x_1),\\
&+\Big[\mu_2\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(s,x,x_1)-e^{-\lambda\delta}\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(s,x,x_1)\Big]x_2,\quad \forall x_2\in\mathbb{R},
\end{aligned}\tag{4.17}$$

Motivated by the terminal condition in (4.16), we try a value of the form

$$V_r(s,x,x_1)=-\frac{1}{\gamma}Q(s)\big(x+\theta x_1\big)^{\gamma},\tag{4.18}$$

where $Q(\cdot)$ is some differentiable deterministic function with $Q(T)=1$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial s}(s,x,x_1)=&\ -\frac{1}{\gamma}Q'(s)\big(x+\theta x_1\big)^{\gamma},\\
\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x}(s,x,x_1)=&\ -Q(s)\big(x+\theta x_1\big)^{\gamma-1},\\
\frac{\partial^2 V_r}{\partial x^2}(s,x,x_1)=&\ -(\gamma-1)Q(s)\big(x+\theta x_1\big)^{\gamma-2},\\
\frac{\partial V_r}{\partial x_1}(s,x,x_1)=&\ -\theta Q(s)\big(x+\theta x_1\big)^{\gamma-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Put them into (4.17), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\gamma}\Big[\beta Q(s)-Q'(s)\Big]\big(x+\theta x_1\big)^{\gamma}\\
=&-\frac{(\mu_0-r)^2}{2\sigma^2(\gamma-1)}Q(s)\big(x+\theta x_1\big)^{\gamma}+\Big(\frac{1}{\gamma}-1\Big)\big[Q(s)\big]^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}\big(x+\theta x_1\big)^{\gamma}\\
&+\Big\{(r+\theta)x+(\mu_1-\lambda\theta)x_1+\big(\mu_2-e^{-\lambda\delta}\theta\big)x_2\Big\}Q(s)\big(x+\theta x_1\big)^{\gamma-1},\quad \forall x_2\in\mathbb{R},
\end{aligned}\tag{4.19}$$

Assume that

$$\theta=\mu_2e^{\lambda\delta},\ \mu_2>0,\tag{4.20}$$

$$\mu_1-\lambda\mu_2e^{\lambda\delta}=(r+\mu_2e^{\lambda\delta})\mu_2e^{\lambda\delta},\tag{4.21}$$

holds, we can rewrite (4.19) as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\gamma}\Big[\beta Q(s)-Q'(s)\Big]\big(x+\mu_2e^{\lambda\delta}x_1\big)^{\gamma}\\
=&-\frac{(\mu_0-r)^2}{2\sigma^2(\gamma-1)}Q(s)\big(x+\mu_2e^{\lambda\delta}x_1\big)^{\gamma}+\Big(\frac{1}{\gamma}-1\Big)\big[Q(s)\big]^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}\big(x+\mu_2e^{\lambda\delta}x_1\big)^{\gamma}\\
&+(r+\mu_2e^{\lambda\delta})Q(s)\big(x+\mu_2e^{\lambda\delta}x_1\big)^{\gamma}.
\end{aligned}\tag{4.22}$$

Canceling the term $\big(x+\mu_2e^{\lambda\delta}x_1\big)^\gamma$ on both sides, we can get

$$\frac{1}{\gamma}\Big[\beta Q(s)-Q'(s)\Big]=-\frac{(\mu_0-r)^2}{2\sigma^2(\gamma-1)}Q(s)\Big(\frac{1}{\gamma}-1\Big)\big[Q(s)\big]^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}+(r+\mu_2e^{\lambda\delta})Q(s). \tag{4.23}$$

That is

$$\begin{cases}Q'(s)=(\gamma-1)\big[Q(s)\big]^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}+\Delta Q(s),\ s\in[0,T],\\ Q(T)=1,\end{cases} \tag{4.24}$$

where

$$\Delta\equiv\beta+\frac{(\mu_1-r)^2\gamma}{2\sigma^2(\gamma-1)}-\gamma(r+\mu_3e^{\lambda\delta})>0. \tag{4.25}$$

By some elementary technique of solving ODEs, we can obtain the following explicit solution

$$Q(s)=\ \left[\left(1-\frac{1-\gamma}{\Delta}\right)e^{\frac{\Delta(T-s)}{1-\gamma}}+\frac{1-\gamma}{\Delta}\right]^{1-\gamma},\ s\in[0,T]. \tag{4.26}$$

We have proved that

Theorem 4.2. *The function $V_r(s,x,x_1)$ given by (4.18) is a classical solution to the generalized HJB equation (4.16), and it is equal to the value function defined by (4.15). In addition, the optimal portfolio and consumption strategies are given by*

$$u^*(s)\equiv u^*(s,X^*(s),X_1^*(s))=\frac{(\mu_0-r)\big(X^*(s)+\mu_2e^{\lambda\delta}X_1^*(s)\big)}{(1-\gamma)\sigma^2X^*(s)},\ s\in[0,T], \tag{4.27}$$

$$c^*(s)\equiv c^*(s,X^*(s),X_1^*(s))=\frac{X^*(s)+\mu_2e^{\lambda\delta}X_1^*(s)}{X^*(s)}Q(s)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}},\ s\in[0,T], \tag{4.28}$$

where $(X^*(\cdot),X_1^*(\cdot))$ is the solution to SDDE (4.5) with respect to $(u^*(\cdot),c^*(\cdot))$, and $Q(\cdot)$ satisfies the ODE (4.24), which admits the explicit solution (4.26).

4.2. Maximum Principle Approach. In this subsection, under the assumptions (4.20) and (4.21), we prove that (4.27) and (4.28) are optimal portfolio and consumption strategies, respectively, applying Pontryagin's maximum principle approach. The main mathematical tool is Theorems 2.5, 2.6, that is, the sufficient and necessary maximum principles.

By (2.11), the Hamiltonian function takes the form

$$\begin{aligned}H(t,x,x_1,x_2,y,z,u,p_1,p_2,q,k_1)&=p_1\Big\{\big[(\mu_0-r)u-c+r\big]x+\mu_1x_1+\mu_2x_2\Big\}\\&\quad+p_2\big(x-\lambda x_1-e^{-\lambda\delta}x_2\big)+k_1\sigma ux-q\big[-\beta y+\frac{1}{\gamma}c^\gamma x^\gamma\big].\end{aligned} \tag{4.29}$$

For candidate optimal control strategies $(u^*(\cdot),c^*(\cdot))$ and the corresponding state

$(X^*(\cdot),Y^*(\cdot),Z^*(\cdot))$, the adjoint equation (2.12) reduces to

$$\begin{cases} -dp_1(t)=\Big\{\big[(\mu_0-r)u^*(t)-c^*(t)+r\big]p_1(t)+p_2(t)+\sigma u^*(t)k_1(t)\\ \qquad\qquad -q(t)c^*(t)^\gamma X^*(t)^{\gamma-1}\Big\}dt-k_1(t)dW(t),\\ -dp_2(t)=\big(\mu_1p_1(t)-\lambda p_2(t)\big)dt-k_2(t)dW(t),\\ -dp_3(t)=\big(\mu_2p_1(t)-e^{-\lambda\delta}p_2(t)\big)dt,\\ \quad q(t)=-\beta q(t)dt,\qquad t\in[0,T],\\ \quad p_1(T)=-\big(X^*(T)+\theta X_1^*(T)\big)^{\gamma-1}q(T),\\ \quad p_2(T)=-\theta\big(X^*(T)+\theta X_1^*(T)\big)^{\gamma-1}q(T),\\ \quad p_3(T)=0,\qquad q(0)=1. \end{cases} \tag{4.30}$$

The maximum condition (2.16) in Theorems 2.5 and 2.6 tell us that, we can find $u^*(\cdot)$ and $c^*(\cdot)$ by maximizing

$$u\to H(t,x,x_1,x_2,y,z,u,c,p_1,p_2,q,k_1)$$

and

$$c\to H(t,x,x_1,x_2,y,z,u,c,p_1,p_2,q,k_1)$$

over all u and $c\geq 0$, respectively. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\partial H}{\partial u}(t,x,x_1,x_2,y,z,u,c,p_1,p_2,q,k_1)\Big|_{u=u^*(t)}\\ &=(\mu_0-r)p_1(t)X^*(t)+\sigma k_1(t)X^*(t)=0, \end{aligned} \tag{4.31}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\partial H}{\partial c}(t,x,x_1,x_2,y,z,u,c,p_1,p_2,q,k_1)\Big|_{c=c^*(t)}\\ &=\ -p_1(t)X^*(t)-q(t)c^*(t)^{\gamma-1}X^*(t)^\gamma=0. \end{aligned} \tag{4.32}$$

By (4.32), we directly achieve that

$$c^*(t)=\frac{1}{X^*(t)}\Big\{-\frac{p_1(t)}{q(t)}\Big\}^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}},\quad t\in[0,T]. \tag{4.33}$$

Motivated by the terminal condition for $p_1(t)$ in (4.30), we try to find $p_1(t)$ of the form

$$p_1(t)=-Q(t)\big(X^*(t)+\theta X_1^*(t)\big)^{\gamma-1}q(t), \tag{4.34}$$

where $Q(\cdot)$ is a deterministic differentiable function with $Q(T)=1$.

Applying the Itô's formula to (4.34), we can get

$$\begin{aligned}
dp_1(t) = & -Q'(t)q(t)\big(X^*(t)+\theta X_1^*(t)\big)^{\gamma-1}dt\\
& -Q(t)q(t)(\gamma-1)\big(X^*(t)+\theta X_1^*(t)\big)^{\gamma-2}\big(dX^*(t)+\theta dX_1^*(t)\big)\\
& -\frac{1}{2}Q(t)q(t)(\gamma-1)(\gamma-2)\big(X^*(t)+\theta Y^*(t)\big)^{\gamma-3}\big(dX^*(t)+\theta dX_1^*(t)\big)^2\\
& +\beta Q(t)q(t)\big(X^*(t)+\theta Y^*(t)\big)^{\gamma-1}dt\\
= & \bigg\{-\big(X^*(t)+\theta X_1^*(t)\big)^{\gamma-1}Q'(t)q(t)\\
& \quad -\big(X^*(t)+\theta X_1^*(t)\big)^{\gamma-2}(\gamma-1)\widetilde{Q}(t)q(t)\\
& \quad \times\Big[\big((\mu_0-r)u^*(t)-c^*(t)+r\big)X^*(t)+\mu_1X_1^*(t)+\mu_2X_2^*(t)\\
& \qquad +\theta\big[X^*(t)-\lambda X_1^*(t)-e^{-\lambda\delta}X_2^*(t)\big]\Big]\\
& \quad -\frac{1}{2}\big(X^*(t)+\theta X_1^*(t)\big)^{\gamma-3}(\gamma-1)(\gamma-2)\sigma^2Q(t)q(t)u^{*2}(t)X^{*2}(t)\\
& \quad +\big(X^*(t)+\theta X_1^*(t)\big)^{\gamma-1}\beta Q(t)q(t)dt\bigg\}dt\\
& -\big(X^*(t)+\theta X_1^*(t)\big)^{\gamma-2}(\gamma-1)\sigma Q(t)q(t)u^*(t)X^*(t)dW(t).
\end{aligned}\tag{4.35}$$

Comparing the coefficient of $dW(t)$ in (4.35) with that in (4.30), we obtain

$$k_1(t)=-\big(X^*(t)+\theta X_1^*(t)\big)^{\gamma-2}(\gamma-1)\sigma Q(t)q(t)u^*(t)X^*(t),\quad t\in[0,T].\tag{4.36}$$

Next, by the adjoint equation (4.30), the condition (2.15) that $p_3(t)=0,\forall t\in[0,T]$ can be formulated as follows:

$$\mu_2p_1(t)-e^{-\lambda\delta}p_2(t)=0,\ \forall t\in[0,T].\tag{4.37}$$

That is

$$p_2(t)=\mu_2e^{\lambda\delta}p_1(t)=-\mu_2e^{\lambda\delta}Q(t)\big(X^*(t)+\theta X_1^*(t)\big)^{\gamma-1}q(t).\tag{4.38}$$

By the terminal conditions in (4.30), we must have

$$\theta=\mu_2e^{\lambda\delta}.\tag{4.39}$$

That is

$$p_1(t)=-Q(t)\big(X^*(t)+\mu_2e^{\lambda\delta}X_1^*(t)\big)^{\gamma-1}q(t),\tag{4.40}$$

and

$$p_2(t)=\mu_2e^{\lambda\delta}p_1(t)=-\mu_2e^{\lambda\delta}Q(t)\big(X^*(t)+\mu_2e^{\lambda\delta}X_1^*(t)\big)^{\gamma-1}.\tag{4.41}$$

Consequently, we obtain

$$k_1(t)=-\big(X^*(t)+\mu_2e^{\lambda\delta}X_1^*(t)\big)^{\gamma-2}(\gamma-1)\sigma Q(t)q(t)u^*(t)X^*(t),\tag{4.42}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
k_2(t)&=-\mu_2e^{\lambda\delta}k_1(t)\\
&=-\mu_2e^{\lambda\delta}\big(X^*(t)+\mu_2e^{\lambda\delta}X_1^*(t)\big)^{\gamma-2}(\gamma-1)\sigma Q(t)q(t)u^*(t)X^*(t).
\end{aligned}\tag{4.43}$$

Putting (4.40) and (4.42) into (4.31) and (4.33), we can get

$$u^*(t) = \frac{(\mu_0 - r)\big(X^*(t) + \mu_2 e^{\lambda\delta} X_1^*(t)\big)}{(1-\gamma)\sigma^2 X^*(t)}, \ t \in [0,T], \tag{4.44}$$

$$c^*(t) = \frac{X^*(t) + \mu_2 e^{\lambda\delta} X_1^*(t)}{X^*(t)} \big[Q(t)\big]^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}, \ t \in [0,T]. \tag{4.45}$$

Next, comparing the coefficient of dt in (4.35) with that in (4.30), if the following assumption

$$\mu_1 - \lambda\mu_2 e^{\lambda\delta} = (r + \mu_2 e^{\lambda\delta})\mu_2 e^{\lambda\delta} \tag{4.46}$$

holds, we obtain that

$$\begin{cases} Q'(t) = \Big[\beta + \dfrac{(\mu_1 - r)^2\gamma}{2\sigma^2(\gamma-1)} - \gamma(r + \mu_2 e^{\lambda\delta})\Big] Q(t) + (\gamma-1)\big[Q(t)\big]^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}, \ t \in [0,T], \\ Q(T) = 1, \end{cases} \tag{4.47}$$

which is exactly the same ODE (4.24) in Theorem 4.3, and the explicit solution to it is (4.26).

We have proved that

THEOREM 4.3. *Suppose that (4.39) and (4.46) hold. Then the optimal portfolio and consumption strategies are given by*

$$u^*(t) \equiv u^*(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t)) = \frac{(\mu_0 - r)\big(X^*(t) + \mu_2 e^{\lambda\delta} X_1^*(t)\big)}{(1-\gamma)\sigma^2 X^*(t)}, \ t \in [0,T], \tag{4.48}$$

$$c^*(t) \equiv c^*(t, X^*(t), X_1^*(t)) = \frac{X^*(t) + \mu_2 e^{\lambda\delta} X_1^*(t)}{X^*(t)} \big[Q(t)\big]^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}, \ t \in [0,T], \tag{4.49}$$

where $(X^*(\cdot), X_1^*(\cdot))$ is the solution to SDDE (4.5) with respect to $(u^*(\cdot), c^*(\cdot))$, and $Q(\cdot)$ satisfies ODE (4.47), which admits the explicit solution (4.26).

4.3. Relationship and Some Discussions. In addition, the relations in Theorem 3.1 can be easily verified. In fact, relationship (3.1) is obvious from (4.16). And the relations given in (3.2) can be easily obtained from (4.18), (4.40), (4.41), (4.42), (4.43) and $q(t) = e^{-\beta t}, \forall t \in [0,T]$.

From the condition (4.46), we can get

$$\mu_1 = \lambda\mu_2 e^{\lambda\delta} + (r + \mu_2 e^{\lambda\delta})\mu_2 e^{\lambda\delta} = \mu_2 e^{\lambda\delta}(\lambda + r + \mu_2 e^{\lambda\delta}). \tag{4.50}$$

So is is easy to see that $\mu_1 = 0$ if and only if $\mu_2 = 0$, provided that $\mu_2 \geq 0$ and $\lim\limits_{\mu_2 \to \infty} \mu_1 = \infty$. In other words, the price dynamics of $X(t)$ must depend on both $X_1(t)$ and $X_2(t)$ at the same time, in order to obtain an explicit solution of V, u^* and c^* in a finite dimensional space. Otherwise, when $\mu_2 = 0$ (then $\mu_1 = 0$), that is, the dynamic equation of $X(t)$ does not depend on $X_1(t)$ and $X_2(t)$ explicitly, our model reduces to the consumption and portfolio optimization model with recursive utility but without delay.

5. Conclusion. Pontryagin's maximum principle and Bellman's dynamic programming, the most important two different approaches to study deterministic and stochastic optimal control problems which are systematically discussed in Yong and Zhou [33], are also two main tools to deal with stochastic control problems with time delay. Both of these two approaches have been developed separately and independently. In this paper, we have initiated to discuss the relationship between maximum principle and dynamic programming for one kind of stochastic recursive optimal control problems with time delay, when only the pointwise and distributed time delays in the state variable is considered. One advantage for this kind time delay is that the corresponding generalized HJB equation is finite dimensional, under some suitable conditions on the coefficients. Sufficient and necessary maximum principles are also proved. Under the assumption that the value function is enough smooth, we obtained its relations with the adjoint processes and the generalized Hamiltonian function. A consumption and portfolio optimization problem with recursive utility and bounded memory in the financial market, was discussed to show the applications of our result. Explicit solutions for optimal portfolio and consumption strategies in a finite dimensional space derived by the two different approaches, coincide.

While our work makes a substantial initial step in the studying of the relationship between Pontryagin's maximum principle and Bellman's dynamic programming approaches to the stochastic recursive optimal control problems with time delay, more remains to be done. Potential extensions of the present work include the consideration of the problem of stochastic delayed system under model uncertainty in Pamen [24]. This will be considered in our future research.

REFERENCES

[1] N. Agram, S. Haadem, B. Øksendal and F. Proske, *A maximum principle for infinite horizon delay equations*, Preprint in Pure Mathematics, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway, June 2012.

[2] N. Agram and B. Øksendal, *Infinite horizon optimal control of forward-backward stochastic differential equations with delay*, arXiv.org/abs/1302.1723v1 [math.OC], February 2013.

[3] M. H. Chang, T. Pang and M. Pemy, *Optimal control of stochastic functional differential equations with a bounded memory*, Stochastics: An International Journal of Probability and Stochastic Processes, 80(2008), pp. 69–96.

[4] M. H. Chang, T. Pang and Y. P Yang, *A stochastic portfolio optimization model with bounded memory*, Mathematics in Operations Research, 36(2011), pp. 604–619.

[5] L. Chen and Z. Wu, *Maximum principle for the stochastic optimal control problem with delay and application*, Automatica, 46(2010), pp. 1074–1080.

[6] L. Chen and Z. Wu, *Dynamic programming principle for stochastic recursive optimal control problem with delayed systems*, ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations, 18(2012), pp. 1005–1026.

[7] D. Duffie and L. G. Epstein, *Stochastic differential utility*, Econometrica, 60(1992), pp. 353–394.

[8] N. El Karoui, S. G. Peng and M. C. Quenez, *Backward stochastic differential equations in finance*, Mathematical Finance, 7(1997), pp. 1–71.

[9] N. El Karoui, S. G. Peng, and M. C. Quenez, *A dynamic maximum principle for the optimization of recursive utilities under constraints*, The Annals of Applied Probability, 11(2001), pp. 664–693.

[10] I. Elsanosi and B. Larssen, *Optimal consumption under partial observations for a stochastic system with delay*, Preprint in Pure Mathematics, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway, December 2001.

[11] I. Elsanosi, B. Øksendal and A. Sulem, *Some solvable stochastic control problems with delay.* Stochastics & Stochastics Reports, 71(2000), pp. 69–89.

[12] S. Federico, *A stochastic control problem with delay arising in a pension fund model*, Finance & Stochastics, 15(2011), pp. 421–459.

[13] M. Fuhrman, F. Masiero and G. Tessitore, *Stochastic equations with delay: optimal control*

via BSDEs and regular solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations. SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 48(2010), pp. 4624–4651.

[14] J. H. Huang, X. Li and J. T. Shi, *Forward-Backward linear quadratic stochastic optimal control problem with delay*, Systems & Control Letters, 61(2012), pp. 623–630.

[15] J. H. Huang and J. T. Shi, *Maximum principle for optimal control of fully coupled forward-backward stochastic differential delayed equations*, ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations, 18(2012), pp. 1073–1096.

[16] V. B. Kolmanovskii and T. L. Maizenberg, *Optimal control of stochastic systems with aftereffect*, Stochastic Systems, Translated from Avtomatika i Telemekhanika, 1(1973), pp. 47–61.

[17] V. B. Kolmanovskii and L. E. Shaikhet, *Control of Systems with Aftereffect*, Translation of Mathematical Monographs, 157, American Mathematical Society, 1996.

[18] B. Larssen, *Dynamic programming in stochastic control of systems with delay*, Stochastics & Stochastics Reports, 74(2002), pp. 651–673.

[19] B. Larssen and N. H. Risebro, *When are HJB-equations in stochastic control of delay systems finite dimensional?*, Stochastic Analysis and Applications, 21(2003), pp. 643–671.

[20] S. E. A. Mohammed, *Stochastic Functional Differential Equations*, Pitman, 1984.

[21] S. E. A. Mohammed, *Stochastic differential equations with memory: theory, examples and applications, Stochastic Analysis and Related Topics VI. The Geido Workshop, 1996*, Progress in Probability, Birkhauser, 1998.

[22] B. Øksendal and A. Sulem, *A maximum principle for optimal control of stochastic systems with delay, with applications to finance*, J. M. Menaldi, E. Rofman, A. Sulem, eds., Optimal Control and Partial Differential Equations-Innovations and Applications, IOS Press, Amsterdam, 2000.

[23] B. Øksendal, A. Sulem and T. S. Zhang, *Optimal control of stochastic delay equations and time-advanced backward stochastic differential equations*, Advances in Applied Probability, 43(2011), pp. 572–596.

[24] O. M. Pamen, *Optimal control for stochastic delay system under model uncertainty: a stochastic differential game approach*, Preprint in Pure Mathematics, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway, September 2011.

[25] S. G. Peng and Z. Yang, *Anticipated backward stochastic differential equations*, The Annals of Probability, 37(2009), pp. 877–902.

[26] M. Schroder and C. Skiadas, *Optimal consumption and portfolio selection with stochastic differential utility*, Journal of Economic Theory, 89(1999), pp. 68–126.

[27] J. T. Shi, *Maximum principle of recursive optimal control problem for forward-backward stochastic delayed system with poisson jumps*, Scientia Sinica Mathematica, 42(2012), pp. 251–270.

[28] J. T. Shi, *Two differential approaches to stochastic control problems with delay and applications*, Submitted manuscript, 2013.

[29] J. T. Shi and Z. Wu, *Maximum principle for forward-backward stochastic control systems with random jumps and applications to finance*, Journal of Systems Science and Complexity, 23(2010), pp. 219–231.

[30] G. C. Wang and Z. Wu, *The maximum principle for stochastic recursive optimal control problems under partial information*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 54(2009), pp. 1230–1242.

[31] Z. Wu, *A general maximum principle for optimal control problems of forward-backward stochastic control systems*, Automatica, 49(2013), pp. 1473–1480.

[32] Z. Wu and Z. Y. Yu, *Dynamic programming principle for one kind of stochastic recursive optimal control problem and Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 47(2008), pp. 2616–2641.

[33] J. M. Yong and X. Y. Zhou, *Stochastic Controls: Hamiltonian Systems and HJB Equations*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999.

[34] Z. Y. Yu, *The stochastic maximum principle for optimal control problems of delay systems involving continuous and impulse controls*, Automatica, 48(2012), pp. 2420–2432.